LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Canada. Parl. H.of C.
Special Comm.on
Estimates, 1955.
Minutes of
proceedings & evidence.

J
103
H7
1955
E8
A1

DATE | NAME - NOM

Canada. Parl. H.of C. Special
Comm.on Estimates, 1955.

J
103
H7
1955
E8
A1

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1955
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

54035—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. Tucker, Esq.

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fleming
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
Macdonnell (*Greenwood*)
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE of Commons,
TUESDAY, February 8, 1955.

Resolved,—That a select committee to be designated be appointed to consider such of the Estimates as may be referred to it and to report from time to time its findings and recommendations to the House.

MONDAY, February 14, 1955.

Ordered,—That Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanamio*), Cannon, Churchill, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fleming, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, Macdonnell (*Greenwood*), MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Power (*St. John's West*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill constitute the Special Committee appointed Tuesday, February 8th, to consider such of the Estimates as may be referred to it, and that the provisions of Standing Order 65 be suspended in relation thereto.

THURSDAY, February 17, 1955.

Ordered,—That the said Committee be empowered to print, from day to day, 750 copies in English and 250 copies in French of its Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Ordered,—That the quorum of the said Committee be reduced from 14 to 10 Members.

Ordered,—That permission be granted the said Committee to sit while the House is sitting.

TUESDAY, February 22, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Starr be substituted for that of Mr. Churchill; and

That the name of Mr. Nesbitt be substituted for that of Mr. Fleming; and

That the name of Mr. Fulton be substituted for that of Mr. Macdonnell on the Special Committee on Estimates.

Attest.

TUESDAY, February 22, 1955.

Ordered,—That items numbered 59 to 83 inclusive, relating to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration; items numbered 293 to 333 inclusive, 541 and 542, relating to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources; and items numbered 510 to 535 inclusive, 550 and 551 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, as listed in the main estimates 1955-56, be withdrawn from the Committee of Supply, and referred to the Special Committee on Estimates, saving always the powers of the Committee of Supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

54035—2

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

THURSDAY, February 17, 1955.

The Special Committee on Estimates begs leave to present the following as its

FIRST REPORT

Your Committee recommends:

1. That it be empowered to print, from day to day, 750 copies in English and 250 copies in French of its Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.
2. That its quorum be reduced from 14 members to 10 members.
3. That permission be granted to sit while the House is sitting.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WALTER A. TUCKER,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, February 17, 1955.
(1)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. for organization purposes.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fleming, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Tucker, and Yuill—19.

Mr. Hellyer moved, seconded by Mr. Lafontaine,—

That Mr. Walter A. Tucker be Chairman of this Committee.

On motion of Mr. Fleming,

Resolved,—That nominations for Chairman be now closed.

Mr. Tucker assumed the Chair, thanked the Committee for the honour conferred on him, and referred briefly to the proposed activities of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Cannon,

Resolved,—That permission be sought to print, from day to day, 750 copies in English and 250 copies in French of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

On motion of Mr. Jutras,

Resolved,—That the Committee request permission to sit while the House is sitting.

On motion of Mr. Garland,

Resolved,—That a recommendation be made to the House to reduce the quorum from 14 members to 10 members.

Mr. Fleming moved, seconded by Mr. Cameron (*Nanaimo*),

"That this Committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records".

After discussion, the motion was negatived on the following recorded division: Yeas: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Churchill, Fleming, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Yuill—7.

Nays: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cannon, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, Stuart (*Charlotte*)—11.

On motion of Mr. Cannon,

Ordered,—That the Chairman report to the House, seeking such powers as the Committee has recommended.

On motion of Mr. Stuart (*Charlotte*), the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

THURSDAY, February 24, 1955.
(2)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Deschatelets, Fulton, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Power (*St. John's West*), Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

The Committee discussed future meetings and, in particular, the question of a meeting on Friday, February 25.

Agreed,—That the Committee meet on Friday, February 25, at an hour and place to be decided by the Chairman.

The Chairman outlined the matters referred to the Committee, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration being the first department to be considered.

Item No. 59 of Main Estimates 1955-56—Departmental Administration, Department of Citizenship and Immigration—was called.

Mr. Pickersgill introduced his officials and in his opening remarks asked Committee members not to raise specific immigration cases.

There was a general discussion on administration of the department under consideration, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

At 12.00 o'clock noon, the Committee adjourned until 10.30 a.m., Friday, February 25.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

February 24, 1955
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: It is certainly most encouraging to see such a good turnout so punctually at the time set for the meeting of the committee. This morning the minister has to attend a meeting, which he could not postpone any longer than 12 o'clock, but I thought that it would be better to have a meeting for an hour and a half rather than not have a meeting at all, so that we can get under way. We will have to adjourn at 12 o'clock.

In regard to tomorrow, it was hoped that we would be able to meet in the morning again, but I am told by the clerk that this room is occupied tomorrow morning and no other room is available. I had thought that we should begin to meet at least once a day and if we were not making the headway necessary to get the work done that is expected of us by the House of Commons then we might start meeting oftener than once a day. But I think to begin with we should make it once a day at least. I wonder if it would be the wish of the committee to meet tomorrow afternoon, say, for two hours.

Mr. MICHENER: Friday afternoon is not a very good time for many members.

Mr. BYRNE: There could not be a better time.

Mr. FULTON: You run into the difficulty that you would be meeting while the House was sitting. I think that that power was given to the committee, but is it a good thing to do it if it can be avoided? There are some bills that will be on tomorrow, and I think that several others would like to be in the House for them.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is it necessary at this stage to start meeting when the House is in session? If we do not appear to be making enough headway, it would then seem reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN: I felt that if we did not meet at least once a day there would be this difficulty. This is really an extra committee and the members are going to be very busy with all the usual committees, and if we do not get a good deal of our work done before the regular committees start sitting we are going to find that it will be very difficult for us to get the work done. That is what I had in mind, to try to get as much of the work of this committee as possible done before the other committees start sitting. I do not want to insist this very week on the idea of meeting on Friday, but I think that we should resolutely aim at holding at least one meeting a day and even more, if that does not seem to be getting the work done, because everybody who has been here before knows that once all the committees are set up it will be extremely difficult to work in these extra committee meetings unless we take advantage of the comparative lull now to get as much of the work done as we can.

Mr. FULTON: I do not think that there would be too much objection to that statement of general principle, but do you not think that we should try to get a fair run next week in the mornings rather than start now sitting in the afternoons when the House is sitting. Let us see how it goes next week.

The CHAIRMAN: I should really have got some idea of what bills are on tomorrow. Has anybody any idea? It might be something that most of the committee members would not mind missing.

Mr. THATCHER: Most likely, still B.C. power.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is, I do not think that most of the members of the committee would mind meeting, while that debate is being continued. I wonder if the committee would leave it to me to decide in regard to meeting tomorrow afternoon. If there is any real objection from any person on the committee who is very anxious to be here and also to be in the House, I would not call it, but if there is no objection, we would hold a meeting, say, from three to five tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNE: So far as Friday is concerned, I do not see any difference between Friday and Monday or Tuesday and I do not think that that should enter into the argument. There are perhaps other reasons, such as people wanting to attend the House, but that also will be true on practically every day of the week. We have a committee of twenty-six and a quorum of fourteen, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN: Ten.

Mr. BYRNE: If we cannot have a meeting, we will just have to cancel it, but as far as I am concerned I think that we should meet as often as possible while the committee is in operation, and I so move that you be empowered to call the meeting.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would you permit me to say one word? It would not be fair to ask the members of the committee to take a vote on this without my saying this: I have a long-standing engagement for a week from tomorrow, practically at the other end of the country. I suppose that I could cancel it if the committee felt that I should. But outside of that I am prepared to stay away from the cabinet—

The CHAIRMAN: You are very pessimistic, if you think you are going to be here on your estimates a week from tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should hope not. Ministers of the Crown do have a certain amount of work to do outside of parliament. I would not want the committee to make this decision and then be taken by surprise by my absence.

Mr. THATCHER: Just that one day?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Just that one day. God willing and T.C.A. permitting, I would be back on Monday morning.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be wise of the committee to go through with a department until they finish it, but in an event like this we could take up some other department. If the minister were kept away, the committee would not need to interrupt its work. I have a motion from Mr. Byrne that I be authorized to call meetings as often as possible, and I think he had in mind tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BYRNE: That is right.

Mr. FULTON: That motion is rather vague. We do not know just what it really means. I doubt if anyone really has been able to define what is possible, but my feeling about the time of meetings—you suggested meeting Friday afternoons—is that afternoon meetings should be avoided if we think we can get through our work without meeting while the House is sitting. I would raise the same point whether it was a Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday afternoon.

Somebody mentioned it might be the International Rivers Bill and I think the suggestion was that it would only be of interest to B.C. members. I am a little surprised at that. There are three or four B.C. members here from different parties.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Byrne had in mind that if there is any real objection on the part of anyone who wanted to be both here and in the House, I certainly would not right at the start insist on calling the meeting, and I thought we would find out what bills there were and then if any member raised any serious objection I would not call the meeting but otherwise I would.

Mr. FULTON: I think it goes beyond that, at least my feeling does. That is, we would not want to establish it as a principle right now that it is desirable to meet in the afternoon while the House is meeting. If we could call a meeting every day of the week it seems to me that we would be taking a pretty good run at the work of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we will run into trouble. Every week there will be at least one morning and maybe two when we may not be able to meet. I would hope the committee would lay down as a minimum that we meet five times a week and if we do not make headway on that basis that we meet more frequently.

Mr. GARLAND: You mentioned that this room was not available. Is there not another room available tomorrow morning? Can you not find another room?

The CHAIRMAN: No. I am told no other room is available. That is a strange thing in this building. I find it strange.

Mr. BYRNE: Let us not waste this meeting in discussing the next one.

Mr. HELLYER: Have you tried to obtain a Senate committee room tomorrow morning?

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk tells me that he might try to get it. We will make a real effort to get some room for tomorrow morning and if this cannot be done then we can see tonight what is going on tomorrow afternoon and you can count on it that the meeting will be called. If we cannot get a room tomorrow morning the meeting will be called for tomorrow afternoon unless someone raises a serious objection. Is that agreeable to the committee? We will make a real effort to get a room tomorrow morning?

Mr. MONTEITH: We have not had any experience in this committee as yet. Our work might go rapidly and successfully and I do not think we should start off at first by sitting while the House is in session; certainly not immediately.

Mr. BYRNE: I could amend my motion to say that we meet on Friday of this week and you can make it whenever you like.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

Mr. MICHENER: No. I do not want to press the point about Friday afternoon, but I do have an engagement on Friday afternoon. I did not know that this committee was going to sit on Friday afternoon. However, that will not interrupt the business of the House. If it is possible to have the meeting Friday morning, I would prefer it and if not I would prefer to start the regular daily routine next week when we all know what we have to meet.

The CHAIRMAN: I think somehow we will get a room tomorrow morning. That is what I anticipate. I gather from what has been said that there will be objection if I want to call the meeting on Friday afternoon. We want to start this committee on as friendly a note as possible, so if you do not mind we will meet tomorrow morning if at all possible and then we will count on meeting once a day next week, either morning or afternoon. Is that agreeable to the committee?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Now then, gentlemen, we have had referred to us certain estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and we have with

us today the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill who has with him the officials of his department and I am sure the committee would be interested in having him introduce them to the committee. Having done that, we will then proceed with the first estimate referred to us by the House of Commons. Mr. Pickersgill.

HON. JOHN W. PICKERSGILL (Minister, Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce my deputy minister, Mr. Laval Fortier; the Director of Immigration, Mr. C. E. S. Smith, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, an officer of the Administration Division of the department.

I might say that I have come this morning prepared to discuss the departmental administration or the immigration branch. I did not suppose the committee would want to insist upon my taking one of the other branches before the immigration branch and, quite frankly, one has to do one's homework when one can. These are the branches of the department I am ready to deal with now.

Mr. FULTON: May I ask some preliminary questions. As we proceed with the work is it understood or agreeable that—for instance we have Mr. Smith here now—we have in due course the Director of the Citizenship branch, the Indian branch, and the Administrator of the National Galleries.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That would be precisely my idea. Perhaps I might say one more word on this. The view I have taken on what I should do is to use my own judgment when a question is asked as to whether it is the type of question I should take the responsibility of answering myself or the type of question I should ask one of the officers of the department to answer. I do not intend myself to answer questions which do not involve policy and which do involve detail, because I think it would be quite ridiculous for me to turn to one of these gentlemen here and ask him to whisper the answer to me. He is far more capable of giving the answer himself because I do not pretend to be an expert on the details of the department. However, I would like it clearly understood that any question which I wish to answer myself I have the right to answer exclusively.

Mr. FULTON: The other point I had in mind, Mr. Chairman, was whether we could ask the minister, either himself or through anyone who wishes to answer, if he would give us a brief outline of the method in which firstly the estimates of this department are prepared, whether or not a complete review is made each time, or whether you start as it were on the basis of last year's estimates and go on from there. In other words, give us an outline of what you do in the department when making up your estimates. Secondly, what you or one of your officers has to do in front of the Treasury Board when your estimates are before the Treasury Board. Could you give us in brief form a statement of how the estimates are first prepared and what stages they go through before they come before the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN: There is one matter I should deal with now. I should have had put on the record the reference to us by the House of Commons of the departments we are to deal with. But that, I take it, can be taken as read, and the clerk may enter in the minutes the reference from the House of Commons to us of these various estimates.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is the order in which the departmental estimates will be presented before us?

The CHAIRMAN: You will be advised of that. It will be a matter, I imagine, of suiting the convenience of the ministers. Subject to that it will be first of all the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, then the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and after that I believe the only other department referred to us is the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I believe that the present intention is to take them in that order, but if there was any change, the committee would be told ahead of time. Now, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one point I feel quite certain, Mr. Chairman, is bound to arise. Mr. Fulton's question really is the beginning of the examination, but I would like to raise this question with the committee first to see what the view of the committee is about it.

I am sure as I look around the table there is not a member here who has not written me about individual immigration cases. Now, I had assumed that this committee would not be concerning itself about individual cases unless some point of the principle was involved in a particular case, and that this committee would not be used as a vehicle to get information about particular cases; because I am quite sure that if we attempted to do that, it would be impossible ever to finish the work of the committee and moreover I think it would be rather unfair to the members of parliament who are not members of this committee, and I do not think it would accomplish any useful purpose.

By that I do not mean to say that if there are any cases which any member thinks involve some awkward point of administration or law, or illustrates some place where the department is falling down, that they should not be brought up. But where it is just a question of trying to find out why X, Y or Z is not getting here a little quicker, or was turned down, I think it would be quite impossible to carry on in that way.

I think it would be appropriate to have that point clearly understood now without waiting for it to arise in some particular instance.

Mr. CAMERON: I think everyone agrees to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I know that in the Veterans Affairs committee it was well understood that we would not go into individual cases unless it was a matter of establishing some general situation in some way or another. Will you please continue with your answer to Mr. Fulton's question?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. And perhaps I should answer the second part of his question first. The Treasury Board, as Mr. Fulton knows, is part of the Privy Council and I presume that the privy councillor's oath applies to it in precisely the same way as it does to the proceedings in the cabinet. Therefore I think it would not be at all proper for me to say anything about what happens at the Treasury Board when the ministers are present and when the estimates are being examined by my colleagues, because that is where the government does, of course, reach its conclusions; and it is the conclusions which come before parliament.

I do not think however there is the slightest objection to describing the way in which the officials of the Treasury Board—before the estimates come to that board—proceed in conjunction with the officials of this or any other department, in the preparation of these estimates. The estimates really are not our estimates at all; they are the estimates of the Minister of Finance. I suppose that is the correct legal position. It is the Minister of Finance who provides the estimates for the expenditures, just as the Minister of Finance also recommends ways and means to meet them.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I would not expect the minister to say what any one of the members of the Treasury Board did or said. But I was hoping we could get from the minister an outline of the process by which the estimates of this department go through the Treasury Board. What is the procedure?

What is the practice of the Treasury Board in dealing with those estimates; not whether some member of the board wanted to cut them down or some member of the board wanted to increase them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is possible that the Minister of Finance who is chairman of the Treasury Board may come before this commitee and answer such questions, but I do not think it would be appropriate for me to describe the procedure followed in the Treasury Board. I would defer to his superior wisdom. But speaking for myself as a privy councillor and as a former clerk of the Privy Council, I do not think that would be a proper thing for me to do. I am perfectly prepared to discuss quite fully what happens up to the point at which we sit down at the board to consider these estimates. But I do not think it would be a proper thing for me, at any rate, to describe how it is done at the board.

Mr. FULTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, let us see how we get along. I do not want to get into an argument right away, but I do think the minister is being overly cautious.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The minister himself has indicated that he is timid and careful in his utterances, and he stands by that. But to come to Mr. Fulton's point about how these estimates are put into shape up to the point when they reach the Treasury Board for consideration by the board itself, I think I would like to say one or two things and then ask the deputy minister to carry on from there.

The minister, of course, does not prepare the estimates at all. That will surprise nobody. What happens is that the officials of the department, under the direction of the deputy minister who is the administrator of the department, prepare a draft of the estimates; and if there is any new departure either in form or in substance—at least that has been my experience in this department and in the one I previously was associated with—if there is any departure from the practice of previous years, then it is drawn to the attention of the minister before any discussion takes place with the Treasury Board officials, and the minister either agrees to have that done or says—as is often the case—"You had better see what the Treasury Board officials think of that," or he says "No, I do not think we ought to make such a proposal."

It sometimes happens, since these are the Minister of Finance's estimates, that the Treasury Board officials themselves take the initiative in suggesting changes in form, particularly any kind of change which would apply not merely to the department in question, but which would apply to the estimates of all departments. I am sure that the members of the committee know that every year there are some changes made in the form of the estimates with a view to making it clear what really is happening in the financial operations of the government.

I think perhaps I might also say—I am not putting this very consecutively—that obviously one always starts with the previous year's estimates. I do not think anybody ever starts to try to build a new structure. Any Minister would try to follow the well established British system of moving from one precedent to another; and having no precedent, he would always try to find a precedent afterwards.

As a matter of fact, I have had a long experience in trying to rationalize a position which I wanted to take and a position which my friends wanted to take. I think, to get down to brass tacks, I had better ask the deputy minister to carry on.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on item 59, Departmental Administration.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
	A—DEPARTMENT					
59	Departmental Administration.	142	493,651	340,230	153,421	

Mr. FULTON: Before we get down to details of one item, might I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that our job is to examine these estimates primarily from the point of view of dollars and cents in order to see whether the money we are asked to vote for them is used wisely or unwisely, and whether we can suggest other methods or alterations in the estimates. I think that would be one of our responsibilities. So I would like to ask, therefore, whether in setting the amount that is going to be asked for for the purpose of this department whether you start with the amount asked for—the amount that was used in the previous year and start with that, as it were, as a basis upon which to build or whether you make a review. Admittedly you use a set-up, as it were, a pattern already established in the estimates. The minister has told us that. But do you start with this pattern and a row of blank figures in the right hand column, or do you start on the basis of what you asked for and used in the previous year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Before the deputy minister answers your question, I might say that I was once a deputy minister myself of what financially speaking was a very small department. It was perhaps simple because it is small. But I can tell you what we did in the Privy Council office. We took the figures, the actual figures of the previous year. You always find during the course of the year that these estimates do not turn out to be quite right, and you will see how they have been modified during the year in actual practice. For example, you might have had to go back and get another clerk, messenger, stenographer, or something of that sort and spend a little more than you had guessed you would have to do. So whether you spend less or not, on the basis on the year's operation, you would know the actual expenditures for the first six months, because you usually have that information from April, in October or November when you start this process. You then try to arrive at a figure for the next year both in the case of numbers of personnel and in the case of monetary amounts. That is how it was done. Now I think that my deputy minister might continue to answer the question, because this is a big and complicated department.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, before you go to the deputy minister, I wonder if the minister could tell us, along the lines of Mr. Fulton's question, whether this year the Minister of Finance suggested or asked that the estimates should be decreased in any way from last year's figures?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The Minister of Finance is very suggestive. I do not think I should say anything here that is not permitted by the rules of the House of Commons. Any letter which the Minister of Finance writes to me, or any expression of opinion he gives to me is, of course, privileged. But in spite of that fact, it would be betraying no real confidence to say that the Minister of Finance told his colleagues—not once but several times—that he was concerned about the rise in cost of the ordinary services of the government,

and that anything we could do within reason, without interfering with any existing services, to cut these costs to the minimum, we should do. And speaking for myself, I did my utmost to do that, and so did my officials.

Mr. THATCHER: Did you have any specific target figure in mind, when you started out compiling these estimates, of the amount of decrease which you might endeavour to have in your department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I did not.

Mr. THATCHER: No percentage?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, not in my own mind. The deputy minister may have had one, but I did not have.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the deputy minister perhaps answer that then? Did he have any objective in mind to try to decrease his estimates this year at all, as to economy and policy?

Mr. FORTIER: We do our work on the estimates with that in mind, namely, what may not be required for the coming fiscal year, and the experience of the past years, and in that way we try to make reductions everywhere we think there can be reductions.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, when you are going to try to cut money off a department, would you not have to have some objective in mind?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know how far we can go in examining a person's mental processes. Everyone approaches these things in his own way.

The CHAIRMAN: I think this committee understands that your attitude was that there was no set percentage of cut in mind but that you would try to save, consistent with not impairing the public services.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, Mr. Chairman, that would be different from the way in which business would do it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have never had the advantage that Mr. Thatcher has had, of being in any business, sir.

Mr. STARR: Mr. Chairman, since we are talking about decreases and increases of the general estimates, I notice that the immigration department shows an increase of $1,797,987.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. STARR: An increase is shown in their estimates to that amount over the estimates of last year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. STARR: Yet our immigration is now on a selective basis rather than the one it was on two or three years ago.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think perhaps I might interrupt, Mr. Chairman, to say that there was no change whatsoever in the basis.

Mr. STARR: You mean in the basis of operation?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, in the basis of selection.

Mr. STARR: I mean, Mr. Chairman, that two or three years ago your immigration policy was calculated on a broader scale for the admission of immigrants to Canada, but that in the past two years it has been placed upon a selective basis. Now because of that decision of the department, should you not show your estimates on the same basis as that of last year rather than with such a large increase that has been shown?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You have given figures for the whole department.

Mr. STARR: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You do not give the increase for the Immigration branch. There is a negative increase of $120,000; in other words, the vote

for the Immigration branch is lower than it was last year. I think in fairness to the committee I should say right off that the whole decrease is not a real economy. Part of the reason it is lower is that the statistics division of the department which was formerly in the Immigration branch has now been transferred to the departmental administration. Therefore, in order to give a completely honest figure, that amount should be deducted from $120,000.

Mr. STARR: The reason I brought the question up was that we were discussing the estimates of the whole department in general.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. STARR: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But in so far as the Immigration branch specifically is concerned, that would be for the Immigration branch.

The CHAIRMAN: How much does that item amount to? The departmental administration was increased by $153,000 and the administration branch shows a decrease of $120,000.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: How much does the statistical unit amount to? I think we would have to get that for you. That is for the statistical unit only, and what the estimates show for last year and this year—it would probably take a few minutes.

Mr. FULTON: May I go back to a general discussion before we go on to particulars? Could you describe the process? I think that the deputy minister was just going to describe the process from the point of view of preparing the estimates. Were you not going to do that, to describe the process from August through, without of course revealing state secrets?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean in discussing them with the Treasury Board officials?

Mr. FULTON: I was thinking of something wider than that; but let us start with that basis.

Mr. FORTIER: The field staff of the branches are asked to prepare their estimates in August. The various divisions submit their figures of estimates for the coming year to the Director of Immigration, and the Director of Immigration later discuss them with me as there may be some variation according to policy. The other branches do likewise, they generally follow the same pattern.

Generally in September the Director of Immigration has the requirements of the field, and then he starts making a check of their requirements, checking with what they spent the previous year and what is needed in that district for the coming year, and what has been spent over and above what may have been required on particular items in any particular year. For instance, let me take the overseas service as one good example. Last year we may have required money to rent or renovate a building; there is no need to repeat this expenditure in the coming fiscal year, if the mark was done. Then the Director of Immigration goes over every item with his own staff and the heads of the various divisions.

When he is ready, he appears before the deputy minister who then discusses every item and receives an explanation for everything they are requesting. The question of policy, as the minister explained—I will take up whatever questions of policy there are with him and decide if we are going to go along with this policy or not; and in that way we estimate what will be required for the coming year.

Once this is done and approved by the deputy minister, the estimates will be submitted to the minister and sent to the Treasury Board. Then the Treasury Board officials meet with the deputy minister and the officials of the branches concerned and they go over them and ask more questions again; why we should ask, let us say, for $10 here and for $100,000 there; and we

will go into another study with a view to seeing if we have not estimated too much. That is the general procedure followed until we appear before the Treasury Board.

Mr. FULTON: We hear it suggested sometimes—and we want to be fair in this committee as well as anywhere else—that we do know that the Treasury Board officials—just as all ministers know—that the Treasury Board is going to give the estimates a pretty severe scrutiny, and therefore the tendency is for you, as it were, to pad your accounts in the expectation that some of them will be cut out. I want to ask whether first of all for your answer to the question: to what extent do you, as a deputy minister feel that there is in your field services a tendency—which is only a human tendency—to inflate the estimates? And secondly what is the general pattern of your experience when you go before the officials of the Treasury Board with regard to their slicing what you submit to them for approval.

Mr. FORTIER: As far as padding in concerned, that is not something which is practiced to my knowledge. And as far as this department is concerned I can say that every time we put something in the estimates it has to be justified.

Now it may be that when a director makes a suggestion about the organization of his branch there may be a different point of view as to how we would reach that objective and how much money would be required to reach that objective. But it is not padding. We will look at what is wanted to achieve and then reach a decision.

The discussion with the officials of the Treasury Board would be of a similar nature. I look upon an official of the Treasury Board as a kind of financial adviser to us; and where we can make a reduction we do so.

Mr. FULTON: I shall not ask you to pick any particular item out of the hat, but can you tell us as a result of the scrutiny by the Treasury Board officials, whether it does not frequently happen that there is some reduction or slicing of the amount you have been asking for?

Mr. FORTIER: We do come to some reductions after our review of some particular estimates, but you see, the estimates are prepared by the branch in August and throughout September, and some time in December when they go to the Treasury Board, four months have gone by and we may see the picture differently, sometimes, from the way we saw it in the summer, because we are closer to it. We will also know that the things we have foreseen as having to do in the coming fiscal year—that we can do them during the present fiscal year. So therefore we can take cuts, and we agree very readily to that.

Mr. FULTON: Do I understand from you that it is fairly general experience that in the actual process of reviewing your estimates there are reductions made over a very broad field from what you have originally asked for?

Mr. FORTIER: There is a cut from time to time all the way through because the field staff may not know as much about it as the headquarters, or the headquarters may now know as much about the policy or problem to be settled; and so at every stage there is a very strict review of each item.

Mr. HENRY: Do you ever find, in the light of your experience, that they might have gone up in isolated cases?

Mr. FORTIER: No, we do not have that experience.

Mr. MICHENER: This is interesting. I am required to see who is right at the top, so to speak, on public policy. The Treasury Board is supposed to be the ultimate executioner; but let us see if there is not some objective. Perhaps Mr. Smith could tell us that when he is budgeting himself in August, and you duly appear with $30 million which is being put forward as the departmental estimates—

Mr. SMITH: No, I would not have the figures here; but in so far as the Immigration branch is concerned, $30 million is for the whole department. I only have to do with the Immigration branch.

Mr. MICHENER: Take item 59 by way of illustration. I wonder if we could get an idea of where one of those items started out in August and where it finished up when it went into the blue book.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if this is really a very useful line of inquiry? After all, what parliament is asked to consider is what the Minister of Finance has submitted to parliament, and the process by which that is arrived at is, while no doubt very interesting—I wonder if that is what we are really here to do? Are we not here to do this: to see whether we could reduce these estimates still further?

Mr. MICHENER: That is true, but it is interesting to know how far it has been squeezed at this point and I would like to know if the deputy minister has stated that they might vary from department to department—to see if it is squeezed to the last point before it goes to the Treasury Board, and to see if there really was not any reduction after it got to the Treasury Board, or a still further reduction after it got to the Treasury Board.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I must answer that question myself. There were some reductions made after the estimates were submitted to the officials of the Treasury Board during the discussion of them, just as I think one would expect there would be. And there were some further very slight reductions made in the estimates that were submitted to the board before they were printed in this book, but they were very slight ones. The fact of the matter is that perhaps because the Minister of Finance had been the minister of this department, and because he understood its operations better perhaps than those of most departments, he seemed not to find it too hard to satisfy himself that this department was economically administered, and certainly that has been my experience.

Mr. THATCHER: I know this question is not an easy one, but I would still like to ask it. Has the deputy minister any suggestions himself of where he might squeeze a few more dollars out of these estimates as they now appear?

Mr. FORTIER: We could possibly reduce, for example, some of the staff, providing that Canadian people at the border were willing to wait for an hour and a half or two hours before they were admitted. We have to provide the staffs at the border between the United States and Canada. Suppose we were to reduce those staffs by maybe 30 to 40 per cent, it would be a question whether the Canadian people were willing to wait for one and a half to two hours to get into Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: I am not sure they would not be willing to wait; but can you tell us of any others?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one other general observation which I could make, and which is more proper for me to make than my deputy minister. It is this: even when the money is voted, there is an opportunity inside the department to see if spending can possibly be avoided. The expenditures may be compared with last year's estimates, and we have found that in many cases the full amount of the vote is not likely to be spent. That, of course, tends to reduce expenditures, and nothing should be spent that does not need to be spent in the year. That has always been my feeling about the spending of public money.

Mr. THATCHER: With respect to this Item 59, it may be that the minister would describe the details and answer Mr. Starr's question as to why the staff has gone up so sharply in the last year as compared to the last five years? Why has the cost of the staff gone up?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The staff in the departmental administration has gone up largely because of this transfer. That is the biggest single item, and I think that as to the special details of this item the deputy minister could answer.

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): Would the increase in cost of the staff have anything to do with the five-day week?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not in the departmental administration. We perhaps, work harder.

Mr. FORTIER: The administration staff in 1954 did not have the statistics division. This division of the immigration branch has now been transferred to the departmental administration. Also there is the fact that trainees or junior trainees are taken on from year to year in order to prepare them to take positions on the staff of the department, and they are assigned to the personnel division. They come under departmental administration, and also there is the fact that we are now training officers in the personnel division, in order to have somebody qualified all around Canada, in order to decentralize—if I may use that word—the work in the field, instead of doing it all at headquarters.

Mr. THATCHER: According to the figures I have, in 1949, this branch had 14 people, and in 1950 it had 21.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In 1949, Mr. Thatcher, the department did not exist.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, they called it the same thing in the estimates; the Department of Immigration; surely it existed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The department only came into existence on the 18th of January, 1950.

Mr. THATCHER: Very well; 1949-50; you are correct. But in the year 1949-50 you had 14 employees, while the next year, 1950-51, you had 21; and in 1951-52 it jumped to 62; and then in 1952-53 it jumped to 67; then in 1953-54 it jumped to 81, and now it is 134. This is the first department we have examined, but it seems very strange to me why departmental administration at a time when immigration had not been increasing very much, should be going up in such a sharp manner.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I do not think you would expect me to explain the rise from 1950—and I doubt if it is the function of the committee. I understand Mr. Thatcher using his illustration, and it is quite a proper one for him to use; but I do not think it would be possible for me to give an answer, because I have only been minister since the 1st of July. I understand that it went up between 1949 and 1954. But I am only able to explain the difference between 1954-1955 and 1955-1956.

In the personnel division there are 19 additional personnel as compared with last year; how many would be new?

Mr. FORTIER: About six would be new?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: About 6 of them would be new and some others would be transfers to personnel; and the technical services, as shown, have increased by 20; that is a transfer, and there is a corresponding decrease in the Immigration branch. That is purely a statistical agency. You have to take the 20 off the 134 and the difference makes it 114, and then you take the other 10 off and that makes it 104, as compared with 92. I seem to require a larger staff than my predecessor and my office has been increased by one over my predecessor's; and the deputy minister's office is increased by one, and I think that increase is largely attributable to the fact that I asked the deputy minister to provide someone to assist me in the departmental work and in dealing with correspondence which I receive, mainly about immigrants and Indian Affairs matters.

Mr. MICHENER: There is a private secretary to the minister listed there, and there is none this year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: My private secretary is both the private secretary and an executive assistant. He is so good that he has both titles.

Mr. THATCHER: I suppose there is an obvious answer, but I am still not clear and I would like the deputy minister to explain why the staff in the last five years required for administration has gone up by nine and one-half times in a period when immigration has not gone up but has actually gone down.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Since 1949.

Mr. THATCHER: I understand that immigration this year is less than it was in 1950 and 1951.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter that would require some study.

Mr. THATCHER: Why would you require so much more staff?

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter which requires some study and it seems to me that in looking at this the committee would be better off to have the deputy minister prepare a statement on the matter rather than to give a snap answer, because there may have been an increase in the work of the Citizenship branch, for example, or something like that.

Mr. THATCHER: There may have been a transfer between departments.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee will be quite within its rights in asking the deputy minister to examine this point and give us a considered explanation of the increase. I think that would be of more value to the committee than any snap answer.

Mr. THATCHER: That will be fine.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The deputy minister is better qualified for that than I am because he has been deputy minister ever since this department was founded and therefore has knowledge of its operations from the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN: I am satisfied that the committee is entitled to know why there should be an increase in personnel, and I am satisfied that if the department as awhole is well administered, as I think it is, they can absolutely justify it. But we are interested in seeing if it can be justified to our satisfaction.

Mr. THATCHER: Fine.

Mr. MICHENER: We are now getting into detail, but before we do so there are one or two questions which I think can be usefully looked at before we get into the actual principles. Therefore I have in mind that this department—the Department of Indian Affairs—we should leave it for the time being. The department that deals with the admission of people to Canada who are travelling, as well as with the big problem of immigration and receiving would-be immigrants which come over to this country, as well as the citizenship and the particulars of granting citizenship certificates. I do not know how each of these functions and what part they play relatively in the whole scheme; but it seems to me that in looking at next year you should have two things in mind. I would like to ask the minister to indicate—and I will have a further word on that; the point is: you have got two plans with respect to immigrants, the people who want to come—and while Canada is interested in bringing people here, the prospective group may be very much smaller; and in fact it seems to me that a great number of the immigrants were coming over in the post-war years and we have taken advantage of that to some extent; while in my opinion we are now running into a position where we cannot get good immigrants in as great numbers. So this is a second aspect of the problem for the future, over the years. Perhaps you could indicate what your expectations are and what your policy is and then we could look more intelligently at the amount we are asked to expend to achieve the result.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I can say something rather briefly and in general terms concerning the goal or the aim or the target at which we are shooting, or whatever you like to call it. I like to be candid and call it a guess; however, it is the same for next year as for last year.

Mr. MICHENER: Which was about $164,000?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We think, as we look at it at present, that the number of immigrants actually admitted in 1954 can easily be absorbed in 1955 unless there should be some change in the economy which is not now anticipated. Therefore, so far as the immigrants are concerned the number is about the same.

One of the other big jobs of this department to which no one seems to pay much attention, and to which the deputy minister referred a few minutes ago, is that the officials of the department have to clear 50 million border crossings each year and these numbers do not go down. There were not actually 50 million border crossings in 1949. I do not have the figure at my fingertips but it could be easily obtained. This is, however, one of the very big jobs of this department and it continues to grow with the growth of the population of Canada and North America. The number of border crossings which have to be checked grows a little every year.

Mr. Michener referred to something which causes me real concern and it is this question of the promotional activity that will have to be engaged in to get as many immigrants of the kind we want to get in the coming year as we got in 1954. I think more effort will have to be put into that. I do not think it will be as easy to find people, particularly in northern and western Europe, because of the increased prosperity in that whole area. I think everyone realizes that there is a connection between the economic and general social conditions of a community and the desire to migrate. As I indicated in my answer to Mr. Michener's question yesterday in the House, we are faced with a problem concerning citizenship in Toronto, Montreal and one or two of the other big centres. The number of applications for citizenship has increased overwhelmingly. Those immigrants who came to Canada before 1949 and who have stayed here have been resident in Canada for five years and they are in the normal course eligible for citizenship. That means that the large immigration of the period before 1949 is beginning to reflect itself in the number of applications for citizenship, and this is only the beginning. Next year and the year after and the year after that, it will have increased again and as a matter of fact the steps that we are now contemplating taking in Toronto are going to mean almost certainly that we will have to add to the staff over and above what is provided for in these estimates. That will not cost the taxpayers anything because there is a $10 fee and if these operations are carried on economically they should be self-supporting.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I was just wondering about the point which the minister brought up concerning the tremendous amount of time consumed in dealing with border crossings from the United States. Has the department any information which could inform us of the actual practical worth of those inquiries at the border? I have in mind, of course, that the idea is to prevent illegal entries and to prevent undesirable criminals perhaps in slipping over the border. Do we actually intercept people by this means or is it a worthless function which we perform?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I had a question made an order for return yesterday and I had it made an order for return because it will take a little time to assemble the figures. I think the figures will show about what proportion of people we do intercept and turn back. The fact of the matter is, of course, that the word "deportation" is used in two senses. I hope I will obtain the support of everybody here and of everybody else in parliament when

I introduce an amendment to the Immigration Act, if I am in my portfolio long enough, to distinguish between what I call refusals and real deportations. They are all called by the same name at the present time. Someone who comes and presents himself at the border and is turned back is turned back by a deportation order. I suppose that this is strictly literally correct because he is in what we call a port, and he is told to get out of that port, but he has never really been in the country at all, and there is a good deal of confusion between that kind of deportation and the other kind where a person who has been here for some time, as a visitor or a landed immigrant, is asked to leave the country. There is a considerable number of the former type of deportations every year.

Mr. MICHENER: If I could, I would like to follow through the line of inquiry which I started and ask whether we could have any estimate of what the expectations of the department are in the principal countries from which we have drawn our immigrants. I understand, for example, that there are practically no Scandinavian immigrants available now. As the minister said, they are prosperous there and they are not willing immigrants. You have to dig them out. Could we have a brief review of the principal markets, if you can call them that, from which we draw immigrants—the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy and so on?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think any official should be asked to stick his neck out in that field. In that field I feel that I should give the answer myself and be held accountable for it.

Mr. MICHENER: It is a question of expectation?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, quite, and it is not much more than a pretty wild guess, really. I think that the prosperity in the United Kingdom would indicate that it would not be very easy to increase the number next year over the number last year—in 1955 over 1954. I would hope to see it increased. We put forth much more effort in the United Kingdom than in any other country. As the departmental report shows, we have far more offices there and we are allowed to do active promotion in the United Kingdom. We have the goodwill of the government and we have the inestimable advantage that the people in the United Kingdom use one of the official languages of this country.

I am pretty sure that it is going to be much harder to get the same number of immigrants as we got last year from the Netherlands. They have what I think you can only describe as almost over-full employment at the present time. We will continue to get some immigration because the Netherlands government is still following the policy of encouraging emigration.

Mr. MICHENER: They are still following that policy?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

The German government, I believe, until there is a peace treaty at any rate, is under the capitulation, not legally permitted to prevent emigration, but after all we in parliament have approved admitting Germany to the North Atlantic alliance and we are going to treat her as a friendly country and we will not do things there which will be contrary to the wishes of that government. There are already signs of a tightening up there because of what is almost a boom which is occurring in Germany and perhaps because of some tendency on the part of the authorities not to encourage the emigration of productive labour. That is something you can easily understand in any country where such conditions exist.

Now, of course, the situation is that we apply to France the same regime we apply to the United Kingdom. We do what we can to encourage immigration. The French government does not permit any kind of promotional

activity and therefore we cannot advertise or do anything of that sort, but they do not prevent emigration. I would not, however, have any real hope of any considerable increase in the number of immigrants who will come from France.

There might possibly be a little more hope of an increase in the number of immigrants coming from Belgium. The government there is a little more open, I think one might say, to emigration and there is a tendency to emigrate which has gone on continuously for a long period. This is a country in which the Belgian immigrants have done well, and they have some predisposition to come here, but the figures for last year were not very great and again the same economic situation exists.

Now, the other country in Europe from which there is considerable immigration to Canada is, of course, Italy. Even in Italy, however, the economic conditions are much better than they were a year ago; but I would not think there would be any trouble in getting as many immigrants from Italy as we had last year. The only difficulty there might be to find people in the categories of persons for whom employment can readily be found in Canada. That is the real problem in the Italian picture.

There is one other European country which is an important potential source of immigrants and that is Greece. I do not think it will be very difficult to increase immigration from Greece, but again there is this question of skills and the occupational groups which we really want to encourage. There is the problem. I think everyone knows that there is no emigration worth speaking of from the countries behind the iron curtain except the immigration of refugees who have been able to get out of those countries. Also, there is virtually none from Yugoslavia largely because of the very real difficulties we have, to put it frankly, about the security problem in Yugoslavia.

What you said about Scandinavia is, of course completely true. All those countries have a declining birth rate.

Mr. MICHENER: The easiest market, if I may put it that way, would appear at the present time to be Italy. Otherwise it is rather difficult to be assured of any great flow of immigration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is there any net immigration from the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is impossible to answer, Mr. Cameron, because we have never been able to find any satisfactory means of determining how many Canadians go to the United States. I am not talking about immigrants who subsequently in one way or another go to the United States. Net immigration in your view, as in mine, I suppose, would be the difference betwen the number of Canadians who go to the United States and the number of Americans who come to Canada. I would think that the balance would be adverse but that is just a guess. However, it is not nearly as adverse as it has been in almost any other period in our history except possibly the decade between 1900 and 1910.

Mr. MITCHENER: It occurred to me that with the great interest in Canada shown in the United States and with the influx of American capital we might anticipate the very large migration to Canada. Is that in the cards in the immediate future?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is on the upturn. This is perhaps being somewhat indiscreet but as a matter of fact I have been giving some consideration to the question of whether or not we should make some real effort, by launching into certain kinds of promotional activity, to encourage such immigration

a bit, particularly in one sector. I am told that the drifting away from the rural communities in Ontario to the towns is still going on and that in the neighbouring parts of the northern United States there are still many communities where farmers' sons, because of the tremendously high price of land in the United States, are finding it somewhat difficult to become established in agriculture. Because they are people who have that vocation and desire to continue in agriculture, I have been wondering if there would be any effective way of making known to the right kind of people the opportunities that there would be in Canada, either in Ontario or in some parts of the prairies. The United States is such a huge area, and if we were to launch upon any kind of promotional campaign we would be competing with such loud voices, if I may put it that way, I have been a little afraid up until now that any amount of money parliament would permit us to spend there would make such a small impact that it would not be worth while.

Mr. CANNON: In referring to immigration from Italy and Greece you mentioned occupational groups and skills. It seems to me that it might be interesting if you were to tell the committee what the department considers to be the right occupational groups and skills.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe I can answer that very briefly, Mr. Cannon, by saying we consult the Department of Labour and it is a purely empirical approach we have to it. We endeavour to encourage people to come to Canada who are likely to be readily employed at jobs for which they are trained and if the demand for a certain skill is more than satisfied by the existing population in Canada we try to tell the prospective immigrants the truth and explain that they will not be likely to get a job quickly, if they come to this country unless they are willing to take up some other occupation. For this reason we frequently send a new advice to the offices abroad about employment prospects in Canada.

Mr. CANNON: It depends on circumstances from time to time?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, it depends on the employment picture in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nesbitt has been trying to get the floor for a long time.

Mr. NESBITT: I have one brief question with regard to Mr. Michener's question and the minister's remark concerning Dutch immigration. The minister indicated in his remarks that he did not think there would be much likelihood of an increase and in fact there was some probability of a decrease in emigration from Holland because of full employment in that country. Would the minister consider that possibly other factors might assist in the continuation of Dutch immigration at the present level; for instance, the fact that ownership of land in Holland is difficult to obtain and many Dutch people like to come here because they can obtain land. There is also the fact that the standard of living in Holland is considerably lower with respect to certain commodities such as cars, which is due to the high price of gasoline, and the rigidity of their labour arrangements with respect to wages and so on. They have a rigid wage scale like some of the old craft apprenticeships. Does the minister feel that these factors would help to maintain immigration from Holland at its present level?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Without necessarily accepting Mr. Nesbitt's assessment of the conditions in Holland, I would think those considerations do keep immigration up. We are going to try hard to ensure that it will be just as high as it was last year and if we can make it a little higher we will be very happy. However, I think those are the counteracting factors and I think the same factors or similar ones operate in the United Kingdom. There are a lot of people in the United Kingdom who might be better off financially to stay

there than to come here, but the kind of life they imagine we have here appeals to them more than the kind of life which they know they have there. My view is that they are the best kind of immigrants.

Mr. NESBITT: Did I understand the deputy minister to say that the increase in the staff in his department is largely due to the work of the statistics branch?

Mr. FORTIER: That was one of the causes of the increase in departmental administration.

Mr. NESBITT: Could the deputy minister give us some idea of exactly what kind of statistics are kept and what work the statisticians do?

Mr. FORTIER: As you know, everybody who comes to this country as an immigrant has to fill out a form. These forms are sent to the immigration branch and are reviewed by the statistical branch in order to keep statistics. As you will see in the annual report, we also keep statistics on the number of people who have obtained their naturalization and so on. We also keep statistics for our own information. For instance, in order to reply to certain questions which are asked in the House we have to keep statistics on deportations so that we will have a ready answer when somebody asks about them. That is generally the type of statistics we keep. We also keep statistics concerning the age of the immigrants and their sex and so on. I can show you some tables of statistics which are brought out monthly by the statistics branch.

Mr. HELLYER: Do these questions asked by members of parliament cost a considerable amount to assemble?

Mr. FORTIER: Take, for example, the last question about the number of deportations. It will take the office staff several hours to prepare an answer.

Mr. HELLYER: It is a costly affair?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: It seems to me there is always a certain amount of confusion when we speak about immigration concerning the effect immigration has on the labour force and the effect it may have on the market for consumer goods and services and so on. I wonder if there are any figures readily available to divide this total of some 164,000 immigrants last year into the categories of people who are coming here to establish themselves in the labour force and the people who may be coming here solely for the purpose of reuniting the family; brothers and mothers and wives and children and so on?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is just about 50-50, Mr. Garland. Just about half of the total immigrants enter the labour force and the other half are wives or children and people who for some reason or other do not enter the labour force—mothers-in-law, perhaps.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I gather from the minister's remarks that you are doing everything possible to attract French immigrants to Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are doing everything we can without having it regarded in France as an unfriendly act.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I am very satisfied with that. I would ask a supplementary question concerning French immigration. Did this government ever receive any request from the Quebec government authorities within the last few years asking you to improve or to increase your efforts to bring French immigrants here?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, no such request has come to my notice since I have been minister, but that is not a very long period of time. I think that is the sort of question to which I would not wish to give a snap answer. I would have to have the records looked up.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Do I take it that since the minister has been the head of this department he has not as yet received any official request from the government of the province of Quebec with respect to French immigration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is correct.

Mr. NESBITT: I am sorry, but I did not quite finish the question I was asking the deputy minister. Could the deputy minister tell us today or at the meeting tomorrow what statistics are kept with respect to each immigrant: sex, age, background, occupation, religion and so on?

Mr. FORTIER: I can give you that statement at the next meeting.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two brief questions. Is the emphasis in the thinking of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration on assisting immigration or on selling immigration? I mean by that, selling the thought of immigration? Is the emphasis on the effort to get immigrants to come to Canada or is the emphasis on the effort to assist those wishing to come to Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to answer Mr. Monteith's question, but I am not sure that I quite understand the distinction.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am wondering about the emphasis in the thinking of the department. Is it primarily concerned with assisting immigration, and I mean by that assisting individuals who wish to come into Canada, or is it to sell to people the thought of coming to Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We try to do both and as a matter of fact we do our utmost. If anyone comes to our offices and he appears to be a likely person we do our best to get him to come, but this is not our policy in all countries. There are some countries where we do no promotion at all. However, in the United Kingdom, for example, we do our utmost to make Canada appear as attractive as possible so that as many likely people as we can attract will approach us and come to Canada. Now, the amount of effort which is put into promotion varies from country to country and it depends on the attitude of the government of the country and our own attitude. If it is a likely place from which to get immigrants of the kind we want then this would be true.

Mr. MONTEITH: I have another question or two, and I notice that it is practically 12 o'clock and the minister doubtless would like to get away.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is only five to 12 so let us use every minute.

Mr. MONTEITH: I believe there was a report issued about last December which indicated there were some 60,000 Americans living in Alberta who were not entitled to vote. I assume that they are living in Canada and working in the oil fields and so on. How long can they stay in Canada without taking out citizenship papers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As long as they like if they obey the law and behave.

Mr. MONTEITH: How long can a Canadian stay in the United States without taking out citizenship?

HON. MR. PICKERSGILL: I really do not know. I am not an expert on the American law.

MR. MONTIETH: Is it not true that they cannot remain there indefinitely and work without taking out some papers?

HON. MR. PICKERSGILL: That may very well be, Mr. Montieth, but we are trying to encourage immigration. I do not think the Americans are doing so. That is the difference. We think it is a good thing to have Americans come to Canada, excepting certain criminal types and other prohibited persons.

We want them to come here and we do not wish to discourage them by interfering with them because they have not yet made up their minds that this is a good enough country to become a citizen of, although eventually most of them do so.

MR. MONTEITH: There is an effort being made I assume—again to use the word "sell"—to sell citizenship to these people who come into Canada from the United States?

HON. MR. PICKERSGILL: Every time I get a chance to do so I praise Mr. Howe. I think he is the best example you can find.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one question I want to put to the minister and I would not expect him to answer it today. I read an article on refugees and displaced persons and what has been accomplished by the west German government in managing to absorb and put to work these people coming in from behind the iron curtain. They have, as I remember it, absorbed about 10 million people in the last five or six years. I understand it has been a very great problem for them. I have been wondering if we have taken full advantage of that potential pool of very fine immigrants, or whether, because they come from behind the iron curtain they have been finding so much difficulty with security clearance that it has been difficult for them to come right on to Canada. That is one of the things I hope that the minister will deal with, because if there has been this vast number coming to west Germany and they are having such great difficulty in absorbing them, it seems to me that with very little encouragement they would go right on. But I shall not ask you to answer it right now because I think it raises quite a few problems. But you might deal with it tomorrow.

I might tell the committee that on account of their reluctance to meet in the afternoon we have presuaded the Senate to let us invade their precincts and we shall meet in room 368 tomorrow morning at 10:30.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 2

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

WITNESSES:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. Tucker, Esq.

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Power (*St. John's West*)
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES

Clerk of the Committee

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Hellyer, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Power (*St. John's West*), Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

The witnesses supplied information requested at the previous meeting.

Agreed,—That statistical tables regarding immigration, submitted by the Deputy Minister this day, be printed as an appendix. (*See Appendix A to this day's evidence*).

The above-mentioned tables and other related matters were discussed, the witnesses answering questions thereon.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Monday, February 28, 1955.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

54134—2

EVIDENCE

FEBRUARY 25, 1955
10:30 A.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed. Have you an answer to the first question that was asked, Mr. Thatcher's?

Hon. JOHN W. PICKERSGILL (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): In regard to departmental administration? No, the deputy minister has not been able to complete the research work on that question and he will have to be excused until a later sitting. It is being proceeded with as rapidly as possible but it requires a good deal of examination.

The CHAIRMAN: And the other question left over was the one that I asked.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There was another about the cost of the statistical unit. I think that the deputy minister could give the answer to that, both as to the cost and what it does.

Mr. LAVAL FORTIER (Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): The statistical unit, which was in the immigration branch and has now been transferred to the departmental administration, is composed of 16 positions. The salaries for the 16 positions amount to $42,963; stationery, cards and so on, that they need for punching, $1,600; rental of equipment, 21 I.B.M. machines, the machines we use to code the cards, $1,260; the other charges, including arrangements for processing statistical data, for personnel, $2,000; making a total of $47,823. Now, I also have the information on the statistics as they are being kept. The statistics are coded in the department and they are calculated in the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I brought with me, in order to give an opportunity to members of the committee to see it, the statistical information for the 12 months of 1954 on immigration, which would indicate the type of work done in the statistical unit and will also illustrate what I will explain.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there enough to be distributed?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes. For instance, we call for the occupation by racial origin; the occupation by province of destination; the racial origin by province of destination; the racial origin by sex, 18 years or over and under 18 years.

The CHAIRMAN: May be if you wait until they are distributed they will be able to follow it better.

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The document from which the deputy is reading is, of course, not this document at all. This is just an illustration of the kind of thing they do.

Mr. FORTIER: The coding we make. Then the country of last permanent residence by mode of arrival, whether immigrants arrive by ship, plane or other mode of travel; the age group by sex and marital status; who paid the passage money; the port of entry; the port where they were processed; the person to whom they were destined; if they had a loan under the assisted passage scheme, by racial origin, by occupation, by province of destination; the number of refusals at port of entry; the refusals by mode of arrival; the cause of refusal; the nationality of refusal; the number of non-immigrants by port of entry; how the non-immigrants travel. We also code statistics by nationality and by province of destination, under 18 years

of age, at the request of the Department of National Health and Welfare. We also code by age group under 16 years of age for the purpose of family allowances. We code, as you will note in the annual report—of which I have not brought copies expecting that everybody would have one—the various nationalities, the country from whence they came by fiscal year and also by calendar year. We keep and punch the cards for vital statistics purposes. We also code for traffic purposes, and this is most useful for local trades organizations and chambers of commerce. We keep for the Immigration administration statistics as to the number of people who will arrive in any given month, according to the number of visas granted or medical cards issued, and we keep track of full statistics of the work in our various offices abroad. That is in brief what is being done in the statistics unit. Now, I believe that I should correct a statement I made yesterday that we are also coding and tabulating the citizenship cases as they appear in the annual report, but this is not done by that unit.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to ask the minister a question. I note from what Colonel Fortier has just said that you do not keep a tabulation of religious affiliation of each immigrant. Is there some reason for that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, there is a reason, sir. This is a question that I know has excited a good deal of interest at various times. I do not know the full history, but so far as I am aware it has never been the practice of the Immigration department to ask applicants what their religious affiliations were and it is not the practice now.

Mr. THATCHER: I was wondering if there is a reason.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the real reason is that it was felt that this was not information that would be of any particular value in the immigration process. To be quite frank about it, it was felt that it would provide a lot of statistics, which might be a source of dispute, conflict and dissension in this country. We have no official church in this country, and we do not discriminate against people because of their religion, unless their religion involves human sacrifice.

Mr. FULTON: Cannibalism?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Cannibalism, which we object to not so much on specifically religious grounds as on rather wider moral grounds. It was felt that it was not really the business of the state. Now, I know that there are quite strong arguments on the other side. The Bureau of Statistics does ask people about their religious affiliation in the census. To anybody who is an historian, a sociologist or a political scientist, and who was a professional in that field, as I was, this is most interesting information. But having given a good deal of consideration to the question since I became minister, I still think that on balance it is wiser for us not to ask for it.

Mr. THATCHER: I agree with you, Mr. Minister. Would you tell me if there is any conscious effort made on the part of the department to bring people here roughly in proportion to the existing religious faiths?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, there is no effort, conscious or, to the best of my knowledge, unconscious. We consider that this would be a very reprehensible thing to do. Perhaps I should say that I consider this would be a very reprehensible thing to do.

Mr. NESBITT: All the immigrants, we understand, are well screened on certain political viewpoints before they arrive here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps we should clear up the word "political". I do not think that you and I, Mr. Nesbitt, misunderstand each other; however, I believe I should point out that we do not mean political in the sense of determining what kind of political allegiance they might have in

this country. We do not consciously let members of the communist party or certain communist organizations in other countries come here as immigrants if we find out they belong to those organizations. There are also certain other organizations in countries which once had fascist governments. Not only in countries formerly with fascist governments, but also in certain other countries that were overrun by fascist armies there are certain people who belonged to such organizations. If we find it out, they are refused entry.

Mr. NESBITT: At the time when these people who wish to come to this country make application or when people are examined as immigrants do you have any idea, not of the detailed branch of christianity to which they belong, but whether they are christians or Mohammedans or anything? I think it would be important in the screening as to whether or not they are communists.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have never done any of this work myself and I have never been in any of these offices abroad. I think perhaps I should go there. I would imagine that most people who are thinking of moving to a new country would probably volunteer a lot of information of that type. I would imagine that if I were in the position of a prospective immigrant going to another country and I were a strong adherent of the Anglican church I would want to know whether or not there was an Anglican church in that part of the country to which I was going. If the immigrant had some idea where he was going and asked such a question and it could be answered by our official I am sure it would be answered.

Mr. NESBITT: What I am getting at is most of these people are being interviewed for some sort of screening process.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Would they not be asked in that process whether they had any kind of religion?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think we would require people to have any religion at all in order to come to this country.

Mr. NESBITT: Would it not be useful in determining whether these people had communistic tendencies?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that our officials would ask that type of question for that purpose. I do not know, but I do not think they would. I would not.

Mr. FULTON: In discussing the statistical unit I would like to ask a question. This is in reference also to something which Mr. Fortier said yesterday: why you find it impossible to keep, either in your own department or through some other statistical department of government, accurate records or accurate estimates of the number of emigrants from Canada. I understand that there was published in a publication put out by Central Mortgage and Housing a table showing the number of emigrants from Canada particularly to the United States. It was apparently felt by somebody that that was not sufficiently accurate; I understand it was as a result of representations made to the Department of Trade and Commerce that it was discontinued.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Made to or by the department?

Mr. FULTON: Made to them, I believe, and I think they furnished the information to Central Mortgage and Housing, perhaps the bureau furnished it. Why would it not be possible to obtain from the various governments which have diplomatic missions here in Ottawa a yearly total of the number of visas for permanent landing that they have given to Canadians seeking to go to other countries which they represent, and from that and from other information to compile a fairly accurate approximation of the number of emigrants who leave Canada yearly. Obviously most of them go to the United States.

Even if it were felt that we could not rely on accurate information from other countries, then why not confine it to the statistics we do think are reliable and compile statistics for those countries?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I should give the simple answer first and then explain some of the complications. The simple answer is that the United States does publish in its official documents a list of the immigrants by nationality that enter the United States. You and I, Mr. Fulton, are both able to read and we can both read that figure in the United States official publications. It has never been the practice of the Canadian government in any department, as far as I know, to publish the statistics of other countries. But, those statistics are available for the United States and we have them in the department and I would be glad to ask the department to get them.

With regard to emigration from Canada to the United States, where someone goes and asks for a permanent visa and is duly landed, if that is the word they use in the United States, I am sure that their figures are quite accurate; but it must be in the knowledge of every member of the committee that the entry of Canadian born citizens to the United States is absolutely free as visitors, or virtually so. I suppose they have a list of undesirable Canadians whom they will not let in. Many Canadians no doubt go down there and stay there a certain length of time as visitors and we know, because they are being deported back here from time to time, that some of them do not regularize their status. Also there are immigrants who come to Canada and are landed here as immigrants who never become citizens and who subsequently migrate to the United States both legally and illegally. I think everybody in the committee knows that it is not very hard to cross the border illegally. In the part of the country where I was brought up, as Mr. Benidickson knows very well, it is very easy indeed. I have crossed the border illegally myself on more than one occasion. That was long before I was a minister or a civil servant.

So far as other countries are concerned, I suppose the United Kingdom is the other principal country to which Canadians go; there is no such thing as distinguishing between visitors and immigrants since a Canadian citizen is a British subject; he goes to the United Kingdom and does not have to be landed as an immigrant and there would be no statistics available.

Of course, we have considered various means of trying to find out why Canadians leave this country. I know this is a dubious thing for me to do, but I have very recently discussed this question with my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to see whether when people apply for passports we could not ask them why they want the passports and what is the purpose of their visit abroad. My colleague and the officials of his department think this would look like prying and meddling, and they are opposed to our doing it. While we would like to have the information, at the same time I personally do not like the idea of having any more governmental interference in people's private affairs than we absolutely have to have.

Mr. FULTON: Do I understand from your officer then that you feel it is impossible, even confining it to the United States, to get accurate official figures as far as illegal border crossings are concerned? If we know they are happening I do not think we should worry about them, but what about the number of Canadian citizens who go to the United States for permanent residence?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Those figures are published regularly in the United States.

Mr. DUPUIS: Not in Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, they are American statistics.

Mr. FULTON: I do not want to create an intergovernmental incident but what if I were to quote these figures in the House of Commons and state that the figures were accurate and base a case upon them. Would you accept them, as minister?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I would not think of being so impudent as to question any statistics of the United States.

Mr. FULTON: It would be interesting then if we could have the figures for the last ten years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean it would be interesting if we could have the figures of Canadian citizens who landed in the United States year by year?

Mr. FULTON: Yes, please.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They should not be difficult to obtain. I do not think we have them here today but we will bring them at the next meeting.

Mr. FULTON: As a matter of interest then—I would not press this now for a final decision—but would you consider that as a matter of interest to the House and to the country generally that you might include in the annual report of your department in the Immigration section, with whatever notes you wish to attach to it saying these are figures furnished by another government, a regular table showing the figures for the emigration from Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to have Mr. Thatcher's opinion as to whether that additional expenditure should be made by the government before I give an answer.

Mr. THATCHER: We will have to make it the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and Emigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To be serious, I think there is quite a good deal to be said for what Mr. Fulton suggests except that I think the figure would be more misleading than helpful because most people would probably tend to regard it as the figure of the total emigration from Canada every year, because that is the figure on which all these editorials which we read from time to time are based—statements that the net result of the immigration policy is zero or negative or very little. It is generally thought that we bring the people here and that they stay a little while and then go off somewhere else. These figures would not show anything except, of course, Canadians.

Mr. DUPUIS: Do you not think it would be a good idea to know how we do stand? We spend a lot of money to bring people here and we cannot keep our own people in Canada; they go to the United States. I think by getting information and statistics on that we could work out a policy to keep people here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I quite agree. I would not like anyone to think that I would not like to have this information. I would like very much to have it. I think if the information is reliable it would be a most valuable thing for parliament and the public to have because it is the ultimate test of whether or not our immigration policy is worth anything at all, but there is no use pretending that it is easy to get. That is my only point. We do not know about the people who leave. For example, an immigrant may come here from England and stay for two years. Then he might go back to England. He may have gone back to visit his sick mother and it may be that he will return in another six weeks or perhaps he may never come back. Unless you have a kind of inquisition of every person who goes out of the country you are really not going to have figures that are worth very much. My own inclination is to think that particularly if we are going to carry on the policy of having a census every five years—about which I express no opinion for fear of being

questioned by Mr. Thatcher as to whether it will be worth the cost or not; the information we will get from it will be very valuable and it will show the net increase in the population.

Now, our domestic vital statistics are excellent. Practically all the births in this country are registered. The landed immigrants are all registered, too. There may be a thug or two here or there who comes in and is not registered. The deaths are all registered. When you add the intake into the population in a five or ten-year period and subtract the deaths and take the total population figures for the two periods, you can arrive at what has really been the net increase, and in that way there is an audit from time to time which is, I think, much more reliable than any figures we could get by any other device.

Mr. FULTON: Along that line, does the Bureau of Statistics not publish year end estimates of population and also a figure for the deaths and births during the year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. You can work out something that would be partially helpful but perhaps you will remember that when the census was taken in 1951 there was quite a divergence between what the census really revealed and the last previous estimate of the Bureau. Now, the Bureau's estimating techniques are improving all the time and there are immense developments being made in these sampling techniques, but even with all the developments they are not as good as the census figures.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jutras has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. JUTRAS: On this question of the permanent visa, what is the standing of a Canadian who goes over to the United States on a permanent visa, for instance. If he gets a permanent visa in the United States, what do you consider him to be from then on? Does he remain a Canadian?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh yes. Every Canadian born citizen remains a Canadian citizen until he renounces that allegiance and accepts the allegiance of another country. A person who has acquired Canadian citizenship by naturalization and who goes to another country and loses his Canadian domicile may, of course, have his citizenship revoked under the law if he does not take steps to protect it by registering with our missions abroad. I do not say it will be done but it may be done. From time to time I sign submissions to my colleagues. This revocation has to be done by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council does revoke the citizenship of certain people who have been given their citizenship and who have left this country for a long time. I believe, however, that every attempt is made to give them notice first so they can take steps to protect their citizenship.

Mr. JUTRAS: What is the approximate period of time of absence from the country which would bring this about?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It varies a good deal. Perhaps we should leave that question until the Citizenship branch is up for discussion at which time we will have the appropriate people here. When someone has a visa to go to another country and does not give up his citizenship he is of course still a citizen of Canada.

Mr. STARR: This is probably deviating from what we have been just discussing, but I was wondering if the minister would be good enough to give us an outline of the steps taken by the department abroad when a proposed immigrant makes his first application to a particular office. I am interested in this. That is, what is considered as a qualification for entry into Canada and what is considered as a possible ground for refusal. I would also be interested in knowing whether these same steps are taken and if consideration is given in the same way in Europe as compared with proposed immigrants coming from

Brazil and Argentine. Also, what is done when these immigrants land in Canada? What preparations are made or what receiving depots are there for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Your question is getting pretty big now. Would you mind pausing for breath? And in fairness to the chairman and to anybody else who had any further questions about these statistics perhaps we should reserve Mr. Starr's question and take up any more questions there may be on statistics and dispose of them. Then perhaps I should answer the question which the chairman asked yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Did your question have to do with statistics, Mr. Cannon?

Mr. CANNON: In connection with these figures which Mr. Fulton mentioned, about Canadian landings or entries into the United States, do these United States figures distinguish between Canadians who go there to live permanently and those who go, for instance, on business Canadian business men may go to New York four or five times in a year. Would that be considered as four or five landings or entries into the United States ? If so those figures would be very unreliable.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would imagine, Mr. Cannon, that the Americans, like us, make a distinction between visitors and immigrants. But I do not think we should answer questions about American law here. Your opinion about this is really just as good as mine.

Mr. CANNON: It is not a question of law; it is a question of fact.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, even on questions of fact we should remember that we do not administer the United States Immigration Act. I have no doubt that Mr. Smith, who is quite an expert on the administration of our Act, has a pretty good idea about that; but I wonder if it is wise for us to put in our proceedings our interpretations of their administration.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Fulton was going to get all these figures and maybe base an argument on them in the House of Commons so I thought it might be useful to know how reliable they were.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I see your point; and in that regard we will not give any interpretation at all. We will reproduce what the American publications show and present it to every member of the committee; and then each of us can put his own interpretation on it.

I think this question puts me in a hopeless position because I do not know how the American Act is administered; and it would possibly put my officials in an unfair position to ask them to give an interpretation of the way the American law is carried out. But we will find an authoritative American publication and give it to every member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: With a necessary warning that you are not vouching for them other than they are their figures.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Exactly.

Mr. BYRNE: Regarding the statistical value of immigrants going to the United States, does the minister feel that there are many people coming from Europe who have to spend five years here, and then having obtained their Canadian citizenship migrate to the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think it happens very much.

Mr. BYRNE: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Here I am doing right away what I said I ought not to do. But I do not think it happens very often. The American law makes a very sharp distinction between natural born Canadian citizens and Canadian citizens by naturalization.

There was one very celebrated case with which a very notorious person in this country had to do. He obtained a position in an American university some years ago, and when he was on his way to that university and presented himself at the border they asked him where he was born, and he said "I was born in China". And they said to him: "Well, the Chinese quota is filled." You see, his parents were both Canadian born, but he did not get in.

Mr. FULTON: I think they had reasons for invoking that provision.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Probably many of the members of the committee know who the gentleman is. I do not think I should mention his name.

Mr. BYRNE: How many people emigrating from Canada to the United States would be Canadians?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, perhaps we had better wait until we get the figures.

Mr. BYRNE: Does the minister feel that even if we get figures showing that our immigration was equal to our emigration, would that prove that our immigration policy was inadequate? After all, the immigration policy is not one of telling people, after they get here, that this is a good country. What we are trying to do is to bring people here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I think one has to make that distinction.

Mr. FULTON: That is what we lawyers call confession and avoidance.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As I was saying, I think one has to make a distinction between natural born Canadians leaving to go to the United States and immigrants going there. If we are bringing immigrants in to some degree to take the place of natural born Canadians who prefer, for one reason or another to live in the United States, that is one thing; but I would rather keep our natural born Canadians and not bring in so many immigrants. I think it would save the taxpayer's money and on the whole it would be a better thing.

But no one here thinks we ought to stop Canadians who want to go to live in the United States from going; and if, in order to keep our population at what we think is a reasonable level we have to find people to make up for them, there is a feeling that that would be a pretty sensible thing. But I would not be happy if I thought that the real effect of our immigration policy was to bring people here for either four or five years, just long enough to learn a little about our North American environment, with perhaps a spell on relief from time to time, and then when they have become acclimatized on this continent, to have them go over to the United States in large numbers. I think that would be very poor business; and anything that we can do to avoid that happening short of using compulsion of any kind, I think it would be most desirable to do.

Mr. STARR: We would only be a dispersion camp.

Mr. DUPUIS: Are all immigrants bound by contract to stay here in Canada for a determined period of time before emigrating to the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. DUPUIS: Do you not think it would be desirable? A man may come here just for a stop-over and then leave here to go to the United States.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Like you, Mr. Dupuis, I am a Liberal and I have a very strong bias in favour of freedom.

Mr. DUPUIS: I know; but on the other hand do you not think it would be a good idea to bind them with a contract for five years, for instance?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. DUPUIS: In five years time they could learn all the good things that are to be found in this country before emigrating to the United States or somewhere else.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would not want to be minister if that was our policy.

Mr. GARLAND: Are we not getting a little away from what actually is the fact? These people have difficulty in getting in.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Again we are starting to talk about the administration of American law. But I think Mr. Garland is right. The only reason anyone comes to Canada as an immigrant and stays here for two or three years and then goes to the United States is that he was unable to get into the United States in the first place; so he came here to wait until he could get on a quota for a particular country; otherwise he would go to United States right off.

Mr. THATCHER: Speaking further on what Mr. Dupuis said about having a contract, one of the important bones of contention in my constituency is that farmers have signed a contract.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think this is a little unfair to Mr. Starr. That question touches a new field entirely and it really has nothing to do with statistics.

Mr. THATCHER: Well then, to go back to statistics, may I refer to the statistics you put out this morning?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: By all means.

Mr. THATCHER: Those statistics give the racial origins; and I would like to know if the department has any conscious quota set up as to the number of immigrants it will permit to come from each country, or have you any limitation? Do you, for instance, limit the number of Japanese or the number of Chinese or the number of negroes? How do you arrive at it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are no numerical quotas at all except for India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, where we have agreements with those countries.

Mr. THATCHER: Does that mean that Chinese, Japanese or negroes could come in?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Anyone who can comply with all the regulations of the Immigration Act as they exist at the time that the application is considered can come in.

Mr. THATCHER: That does not just seem very clear to me. I know that negroes are not permitted to come in. I am not saying whether that is good or bad.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, to begin with, the department does not know any such thing as negroes.

Mr. THATCHER: But you list them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, but not as applicants. There is no such thing as an applicant who is a negro. This is a description for statistical purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It is included among a list of nationalities.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Ethnic origins here, if you are looking at page one as I am?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There is nothing to indicate that it is ethnic origin.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It says at the top of the sheet: "by Racial Origin". I think the negroes are mostly from the United States.

Mr. THATCHER: I am not trying to be difficult.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Nor am I, really. I am just trying to be accurate.

Mr. THATCHER: How is it that there are so many who want to come in and cannot get in? I would say that that is true of Japanese, I would say that it is true of Chinese, and I would say it is true of negroes. If your department has not a quota, how is it that such a small number of them come in?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Because only certain categories of close relatives are allowed in under the regulations, and it is not possible to produce a synthetic relative in Canada, although sometimes it is tried.

Mr. THATCHER: In other words, it is government policy that those three races will not be permitted in except for relatives?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is government policy, if you like. It is a regulation of the Governor in Council, which I administer.

Mr. THATCHER: To what other races would that apply besides the three I have mentioned? What is the government policy on Hebrews, for instance?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, of course, a Hebrew is a citizen of some place or other.

Mr. THATCHER: You list them here as a separate group.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Suppose you look at the page where it gives the country of origin.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no page like that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is in the annual report. You see, it is the country of origin to which the regulation is applied. This is just a document for statistical purposes to give a statistical picture. For instance, to come back to negroes: that category would include any person from the United States or the British West Indies or the other West Indies or from Africa who, when asked his racial origin, would correctly describe it as negro according to these definitions.

Mr. THATCHER: Could an American negro come in as freely as a white American?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should think so.

Mr. THATCHER: Can an American negro come in as freely as an American white? If not, how do you differentiate?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, I do not think that you do really differentiate.

Mr. THATCHER: But it is a fact that they do not come in, or very few do.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The fact is that there are 167 shown in this.

The CHAIRMAN: It says, "Country of origin". It may be that in that United States figure there are some negroes. Is that possible?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is possible but not probable. It is possible that there are some people with some negro blood but not predominantly negro.

Mr. THATCHER: Just for clarification, I wonder if the minister would start at the top of the page and tell us what is the government policy in connection with each of these ethnic groups. In the British Isles, I suppose, he takes all he can get, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, we do not take anybody who is a criminal or a lunatic or in one of the prohibited classes that you put into the law, Mr. Thatcher, before I was a member of parliament.

Mr. THATCHER: Would you start at the top there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. In the United Kingdom, there are just the ordinary requirements, that you must be able to satisfy the department about health and what I have called "good character", which is an abbreviation. By "good character" I mean that you would have to satisfy us that you do not fall within any of the prohibitions. I do not mean good character in any Sunday School sense at all. If it is understood what I mean by it, it is a very

easy phrase to use and saves a lot of time. Applicants must also satisfy us that they have something to come to, a skill that is likely to get them employment in a reasonable time, or enough funds to support themselves. That, of course, is a general requirement for everybody. We have this provision in the law, about which I expressed some doubt in the House, perhaps unwisely, about the deportation of persons who become a public charge. We think it is most unwise—and the regulations so provide—to let people in where the probability of their becoming a public charge is so great that the taxpayer is likely to be liable for the cost of sending them back. That is a qualification, but, of course, you know that the people from the United Kingdom and from Ireland do not require visas from us.

Mr. STARR: That is part of my question. I was wondering whether you were getting to that.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I thought we were dealing with statistics.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps you had better deal with that point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THATCHER: This is on page 1.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought that Mr. Thatcher was going to ask how, when you have the immigrants by racial origins, you judge a person from the United States, whether his racial origin is considered to be United States or negro.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is no such thing as United States racial origin.

The CHAIRMAN: But you have it in these figures, and that is what I thought Mr. Thatcher was trying to clear up. He was asking the policy in regard to these different items, but I thought he was going to ask how the department arrived at the differentiation between a person of United States racial origin, for example, and a person whose racial origin, we shall say, is negro.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, to be quite honest—

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is this a change, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I won't raise any question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cameron and I understand each other, and he has probed the depth of my stupidity.

The CHAIRMAN: If I may be pardoned, doubtless what you intended to say was, "to be quite frank" instead of "honest".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To be quite frank, I am not at all satisfied with these categories of racial origin. For instance, I cannot understand what is meant by Austrian racial origin. Even if we do not get into a debate on semantics, as to what race really means, an Austrian is either a German, a Yugoslav, a Magyar, or a Czech, or he may be even French or of some other race.

The CHAIRMAN: He might be Ukrainian.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: One thing he could not be in his racial origin is Austrian. There is no such thing.

Mr. THATCHER: What about American; are you satisfied with that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No; to be quite frank, that is put in there for convenience, but if it refers to racial origin it is incorrect.

Mr. FULTON: I do not want to be unduly helpful to the minister, but you have it covered at the top of the document, "Immigration to Canada, by Racial Origin, Overseas and Total from the United States".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thank Mr. Fulton for reading a little more carefully than I did.

Mr. FULTON: In other words, you do not make any attempt to break down the racial origins among cases coming from the United States, except when they are negroes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I had better amend what I said. I am probably wrong. American negroes would be included under the United States. So these negroes here would be from overseas, including the Caribbean.

Mr. THATCHER: Is there any conscious effort on the part of the department to keep out American negroes?

The CHAIRMAN: That is another question. Let us continue with the question of statistics.

Mr. JUTRAS: Can we go to the last page of the table? What do you mean by "Returned Canadians"? I am sure that there are many more than 4,000 Canadians who returned from the United States to Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that either the deputy minister of one of the officers might answer that.

Mr. FORTIER: That includes those who went to the United States with a permanent visa and are returning to Canada.

Mr. FULTON: It does not include those who are merely returned visitors?

Mr. FORTIER: No.

Mr. FULTON: Only those who went first for permanent admission and are coming back?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It could not possibly be. The statistics are that there are about 25 million returning Canadian visitors every year.

Mr. JUTRAS: These are Canadians who obtained permanent visas to the United States and then changed their mind and returned?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. FORTIER: When they returned to Canada we had some evidence of their intention to remain permanently in the United States when they left.

Mr. JUTRAS: I would like to pursue this question as to the exact status of these people, but perhaps I might have to wait until later.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Returning Canadians, I am sure would be Canadian citizens. There is no breakdown between natural born and naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this to clarify this table?

Mr. BYRNE: At the top of page 1 we have English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh. They may be people from South Africa, Australia, or the Indies?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: On page 3, "occupational groups" and then farther on under "destination", there is by rough calculation about 30 per cent more of the ultimate destinations being Ontario than all the rest of Canada put together. Trying to relate that with the occupational groups just above gainfully occupied, you have to find some relationship between the two. Has the statistical department any additional information that would indicate why so many of the immigrants have Ontario as a destination rather than more thinly populated parts of the country? There is some indication in the gainfully occupied groups I know, but is there anything other than that?

Mr. FORTIER: I do not understand your question.

Mr. NESBITT: Possibly I am not making myself too clear. I notice that there are 83,000 persons who decide on Ontario as an ultimate destination which is considerably more than all the other parts of Canada put together. Naturally one would look for a relationship between that figure and the occupational

group above. The types of occupation in Ontario are more than in other parts of Canada. I see the biggest single occupational group is manufacturing and mechanical and construction which takes in a very wide field of endeavour. I was wondering if these gainfully occupied groups are further broken down in some other figures which you may have so that we could find some other reason why so many go to Ontario rather than to other parts of the country which are less populated?

Mr. FORTIER: I believe you will find this information on table 6 of the annual report:

Intended occupation of immigrants by province of destination fiscal year ended March 31, 1954.

Mr. STARR: In respect to statistics of immigration to Canada by racial origin I would like to know, if for instance immigration was allowed to Canada from Hungary in the case of a Pole who has been residing in Hungary who wishes to migrate to Canada and is in possession of a Hungarian passport, whether his national origin would be Hungarian or Polish?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Polish; that is if it were properly done. You know there are lots of mistakes made in filling in these forms. Within reason we take their word about it. I could give a very amusing illustration of that when the national registration took place in 1940. An associate of mine described his racial origin as French Canadian. I said to him: "Why do you put that down?" He said to me: "I wanted to make it clear that I was not a Frenchman from France." I replied: "Well where was your grandfather born?" And he replied: "In Northampton, England," I said: "Erase it and put English," He was a French speaking Canadian but according to the definition we use that was the correct description, but a lot of people do not put it that way in such circumstances.

Mr. FULTON: On page 3, in connection with the breakdown of figures could you give us a brief outline of what you include in the classification of gainfully occupied? You have manufacturing, mechanical and construction 25,699 and then labourers 13,011. Are we to take it that all those separately listed are not actually working men in those categories and that all the working men are included under labourers; or are the others classifications of working men and those whom you cannot classify you have lumped together as labourers?

Mr. FORTIER: There is no repetition. That is the point I wish to make. It is a classification for each trade or occupation.

Mr. FULTON: Would you consider just for classification purposes under the heading labourers putting "not classified by industry or trade".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think you have a real point. It is obvious there were more than 428 people among the immigrants who went to the mines. I think everybody would know that.

Mr. CAMERON: Is this not just a question of distinction between mechanical and labourers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Referring to the figure for mining, they are actual miners.

Mr. CAMERON: Is this not just a question of distinction between mechanical and labourers; a distinction which is understood throughout industry?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think perhaps I had better keep quiet about this. I obviously do not know.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Cameron says labour means in general unskilled labour. Is that the sense in which it is used here?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. SMITH: The labourers are the unskilled persons; the ones in the manufacturing and mechanical construction are semi-skilled, or skilled.

Mr. FULTON: Thank you. Perhaps, for those who are not as knowledgeable in this field as myself, you might put "unskilled" in, and I would not have to ask the question another year.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another thing which perhaps should be made plain as we will be putting this in as an appendix to our proceedings. Would you explain what is meant by "northern European races?"

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The purpose of that is to describe the ones listed on page one.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean the list starting with: Austrian, Belgian, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish and Swiss—those are the northern European races?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. If this committee will recommend some rationalization of these categories so I will not be accused of trying to cook the statistics, I would certainly like to see some changes made in these categories. I think some of them are ridiculous as they stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Another question to make it clear, the reference to "other races" in that table refers to those races starting with Albanian and Arabian and concluding with Ukrainian.

Mr. STARR: Following up the question of racial origin, I would like to get this clear in my mind. I hope I am not deviating from what we have just been discussing. If, for example, an Ukrainian from a displaced persons camp who has a Polish passport arrives in Canada and after five years is qualified for citizenship papers, I am informed that some difficulty has been encountered in having the Ukrainian racial origin placed on the citizenship papers.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The deputy minister tells me that has been corrected but you might raise that question again when the Citizenship people are here and you might raise any similar difficulties because these things do create confusion; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask a question concerning page three of this table. I would like to know whether or not the destination of the immigrants is recorded more particularly in the Department of Statistics. For instance, you have shown here that 83,000 immigrants arrived in Ontario and you also list Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta, the actual developing industrial areas which have absorbed most of the people. Can you break down the destinations within Ontario and give us the number of immigrants who settled in various towns?

Mr. FORTIER: You want to know whether they went to Toronto or London and so on?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, and I would like the same information for Quebec. How many went to the Montreal area?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do not have any breakdown at all. I stuck my neck out in Toronto by stating that my guess was at least one-fifth of all immigrants were in the Toronto metropolitan area, but I did my own arithmetic and took full responsibility for it. I think it is just about right although perhaps I am a little on the low side. We do not have that figure in the department, and I do not think we could assemble it for you. We could perhaps tell you how many went to London to be placed and how many went to Toronto to be placed and so on, but it would require a lot of additional work, and these people move around a lot and you would not have anything which would be valid.

Mr. MICHENER: This is just their general destination when they came to Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose they do say what city they are landing in.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, but there are no records assembled of their precise destinations, so there is no way of arriving at the breakdown of the 83,000 immigrants in Ontario who settled in various places within the province.

Mr. MICHENER: Even temporarily?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

The CHAIRMAN: It is agreed, I take it, that we will have the table which was filed by the minister made an appendix to our proceedings today because we have asked questions about it. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

Mr. MICHENER: When we come to discuss citizenship perhaps the officials will have a more accurate idea of where the citizens are.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are difficulties there, too, but we will discuss them when we reach that point.

Mr. MICHENER: I want to ask the minister a question concerning the statistical department. I think the minister told us there are 32 people involved in the transfer of the statistical group to the administrative category?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are 16 people.

Mr. MICHENER: And does that involve an actual transfer of people into different quarters or is it just an administrative transfer?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is just drawing an artificial line on a piece of paper somewhere. They are in the same rooms.

Mr. MICHENER: And does this work duplicate in any way the work by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. FORTIER: No, we help each other. What we are doing in the statistical department is not done by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it is against the law for any department to do any statistical work without the approval of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I think parliament has legislated in that regard, but I do not think it applies to the private arithmetic done by ministers—at least I hope not.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to know about the extent of the publication of the statistical information which this branch compiles. We have the annual report. Are there any other statistical publications about immigration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe there is a monthly statement issued to the press as well as the one which is issued at the end of the calendar year.

Mr. MICHENER: There are just the two?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, apart from what is in the annual report, and what is published from time to time in Hansard or in returns. That is what I understand.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the Dominion Bureau of Statistics publish any of this information?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics may publish a good many of the results of this work.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose this information is always available for the public upon inquiry to the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Without charge?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I hesitate to invite more clerical work in the department. I do not think we would want to provide information for which there did not seem to be some obvious use and that it would take a long time to compile.

Mr. MICHENER: I am thinking, Mr. Chairman, of the rather limited publication of a lot of excellent statistical work which would be of interest to many people and also it comes out rather late. For instance, the annual report appears to have been published late.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think perhaps I was a little to blame for the lateness of the publication of the annual report this year.

Mr. MICHENER: I was just wondering whether this information is actually available to anyone who is interested?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, certainly to members of parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: I think if you will inquire at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics you will find that they have prepared many different statistics concerning what the census shows about various aspects of immigration. If you are interested, I think you can find out from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics what is being done in that regard.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on this?

Mr. STARR: In compiling the statistics concerning racial origin do you accept the word of the person about his racial origin or does he have to produce a passport?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The passport would not be any basis really. I understand, saving always that someone may obviously be lying, the word of the person is taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions concerning the actual statistics? If not, we will pass on to whatever question you wish to take next, Mr. Pickersgill.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it is a courtesy to the chairman to answer his question next. The chairman asked yesterday—if I may paraphrase his question because I did not take it down and it was a little longer than I can remember word for word—if any serious efforts had been made by the department to draw immigrants from this pool of persons of German nationality who had left the eastern part of Germany—the Russian zone of Germany—and moved into west Germany and were having to be resettled there in some fashion or other unless they could migrate.

The CHAIRMAN: I had in mind too the refugees and displaced persons; the Ukrainians, the Lithuanians and Estonians and all that group.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I could deal first with the group I have defined, because this is relatively a recent problem; I mean, this migration began to take place on rather an extensive scale in 1952. Of course there were a lot of people who had come earlier than that, of German nationality. And now we took the view that these people—and it was announced officially I am told in March 1953—that refugees from east Germany were admissible to Canada just like any other German nationals provided they could meet the ordinary requirements of the law.

This may sound silly, until I add that the general rule is that a person who comes from countries behind the iron curtain must remain for two years in some country on this side of the iron curtain before he can be admitted to Canada. The reason is that we have no facilities which we consider worth anything for the security screening of people while they are behind the iron

curtain; and this is a kind of rough rule of thumb, if you like, that has been established for the purpose of having an opportunity to scrutinize these people to see whether they are bona fide refugees, or to form some judgment as to whether they are safe while if they were taken right away they might be people who were being planted here. It has happened in some instances that in the case of close relatives there has been a good deal of hardship, and I have not had any more painful cases to consider since I became minister than some of those cases.

Mr. STARR: May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Please let the minister finish.

Mr. STARR: I wonder if the same proviso would apply to Yugoslav people who have come out of Yugoslavia? Would they have to go through the same two year period?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The same rule applies to Yugoslavs. Perhaps later on I might say something about why it does; and it also was applied before March, 1953 to the eastern zone of Germany for exactly the same reasons. It was perfectly obvious that the movement which took place in 1952 was in the main a genuine movement of refugees. If we were reasonably satisfied that they were bona fide refugees—because they were not all—then the two year rule was not applied. But it was a matter of judgment whether there was a reasonable ground for suspecting they were not bona fide refugees. I have no doubt whatever that some of our judgments in the matter have been wrong, but I do not know any other way it can possibly be done than that. And within those limitations which I have set out, these German nationals from the eastern zone of Germany are eligible in exactly the same way as nationals from the western zone of Germany. There is no distinction made. Of course, I imagine they are really more prone to migrate because they had not been settled or established in western Germany. That is one reason, I suppose, that we have had large numbers of German immigrants in the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN: That raises another question. There was a tendency for some time for Ukrainians, Polish people, Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians to cross from behind the iron curtain; but I have heard that more recently some of them are going back again, and that there is not the movement westward there used to be.

It would be understandable why the people of German would find it easier to get from behind the iron curtain, because they would find more help in west Germany. The people there do have the same racial origin; but those of other than German racial origin would find it almost impossible to make a living and exist in the overcrowded condition prevailing in West Germany. This policy, it would appear, would make it practically impossible for people of other than German racial origin to come from behind the iron curtain. That is the impression I got. Is there not some way around that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is very difficult, there is no doubt about that. But it did not apply to the vast movement of those who were refugees in 1945 and 1946. As the committee knows, that was before I became minister, and a good part of it took place before my predecessor became a minister and before the department was established. We have received very large numbers of these refugees, but I do not think they are the people you are referring to at all.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. FULTON: Did not the closing of the IRO operations in Europe make the situation more difficult?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite. The proportions in which people are coming are apparently not very great. There is no doubt that there are cases of individual hardship from time to time, where someone has relatives here in Canada, and where the circumstances seem to be such that the security risk is very slight indeed, and as I think perhaps nearly all the members of the committee know, both my predecessor and I have taken the responsibility from time to time within reason to waive security in such cases.

Mr. THATCHER: Could you not examine these people once they got there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do, but we do not reach our conclusion about security just by the answers which these individuals give. We cause inquiries to be made about them, but it is quite out of the question to make any inquiry which has any real validity today in Poland or Czechoslovakia, and certainly not in the Soviet Union.

Mr. MCLEOD: Are any other countries besides Canada taking that same stand on the two year provision or probation, if you might call it that, against these refugees?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: My information about other countries is too limited and I do not know the answer to that question. But I have rather the impression that our policy with respect to the admission of refugees is at least as liberal as that of any country overseas including Australia. I have that impression but again I am talking about things I do not really know about.

The CHAIRMAN: Immediately following the end of the second war it was more generous. I do not know if it has remained so or not, but it was certainly so immediately following the war. We were the first country to admit people of German racial origin but not of German nationality the "Folk Deutche" of any country in the world, but whether we still hold that position or not I do not know.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There has been no change in our criterion whatsoever.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): With respect to your answer to Mr. Starr and in regard to Yugoslavia, I did not want to bring it up this morning, but I have this in mind; you said that we would not take up individual cases unless they illustrated a principle.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Well then, I am sure the minister will know what ones I refer to when I speak of them. I refer to two young Yugoslav women who were fiances of Canadians of Yugoslav origin. In examining the correspondence in respect to these cases your predecessor has, at different times, informed those who have written about these cases and has given this information: that the reason these two young women—and they are just cases in point—cannot be admitted is that we lack the facilities in Yugoslavia for processing them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): On the other hand, wives, children and aged parents who are wholly dependent are processed in Yugoslavia, so apparently we do have the facilities there for doing that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): A promise has been made to improve the facilities. And today I notice that the minister has classed Yugoslavia in much the same position as countries behind the iron curtain.

Hon Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was trying to draw a distinction.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I think that raises quite an important problem of principle in regard to immigration policy. I think it is rather exaggerated

and I doubt very much if it is necessary or possible for the Soviet Union to put any number of spies in Canada. I think they can get them here, because our past experience has shown us that. But I do not think that is the case so far as Yugoslavia is concerned. People coming here, who might be dangerous, are dangerous not because of any political theory or philosophy they adhere to, but because they come as agents of a foreign and potential enemy. But with Yugoslavia that is not the case. Does this not mean that the government is placing a bar against peaceful people because of the political philosophy to which they adhere without regard to the possible subversive tendencies of the masses?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to ask if Mr. Starr objects to my answering this question. I undertook that I would answer his question right after yours. If he does not object—

Mr. STARR: No, it is quite all right. It would clear up the point.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is not only about as complicated a question as could be asked about this matter, but it really does illustrate a good deal of the whole problem of security screening, which is, I confess quite frankly, the most difficult problem that we have. Now, I do not think that Mr. Cameron wants me to engage in a debate with him as to whether a security screening is necessary or not. It happens to be the policy of the government and, so far as I am concerned, I am carrying it out. The attitude that we take about Yugoslavia is this. It is true that we can send one or two people to our embassy in Belgrade and these people can make the usual efforts to find out if a person presenting himself is really beyond reasonable doubt, the wife or the young child of some Canadian citizen. If that Canadian citizen himself is a person of good character and good repute in his own community and has no connections that we regard as in any way dangerous to the state, it is a matter of policy that we take whatever risk may be involved in admitting the wife and young children. I would agree in these cases that the risk is probably not very great that his wife or young children may be communists, not of the Yugoslav government type but of the other type who, I am told, still do exist in Yugoslavia. Of course, we do, as I think most of the members of the committee know, waive security in the case of parents of Canadian citizens who can get out from behind the iron curtain and who are over 65 years of age. They may be the most convinced and dangerous communists possible, but unless we know that they are and unless they have records which make us sure that they are, this is for humanitarian reasons one of the risks that we do, as a matter of conscious policy, take. I must say that I think it has been thoroughly justified. In many cases a great deal of misery to individual families has been avoided, because some of these people have been able, for some reason or other, to get out. That is why we have the facilities for those kinds of persons. Now, if we were quite convinced that the government of Yugoslavia had successfully converted all the people of Yugoslavia from their attachment to Russian communism, if you like to put it that way, or to communist imperialism, if I may put it that way—I think everybody knows what I mean anyway—if we were convinced of that, I do not think the fact that somebody advocated theoretical communism would be regarded by many of us as an obstacle to his migration to Canada. As a matter of fact, if I came across someone from the United Kingdom or the United States who subscribed to theoretical communism but was not a member of a communist organization or anything of that sort, my personal inclination would be to say that he was not a security risk. However, there is no doubt that the Yugoslav communists, even the ones who support the present regime there, are, of course, in disagreement with our kind of government, our system of government and our system of running society. I think a great many Canadians would not think them

particularly suitable immigrants for entry in large numbers. But in a case of a close relative or where there is a question of reuniting a family, I think we would have to weigh the circumstances of the case.

Mr. STARR: They would still have to wait two years?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The reason for the waiting period of two years is really to find out how they behave and that sort of thing. Again, in some cases, this is waived where all the circumstances seem to be such that the risk is virtually nonexistent.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I have two other questions I should like to ask the minister. One is this. Has the government any means, for instance, of knowing that the West German government has succeeded in winning all the German people away from the Nazi ideas?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh, no.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The same argument should apply there.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, we do not pretend to have any "thought police" in our department. The fact that someone may have or have had Nazi ideas would not of itself be an obstacle. We use a rather more objective test. If we can find any evidence that certain Germans, or certain Italians for that matter, belonged to certain types of Nazi or Fascist terrorist organizations, we regard that as prima facie evidence that they are undesirable people for admission to Canada and we do not give them visas. Now, once in a while we are fooled and somebody turns up in this country, and when that happens we do examine the record rather more carefully. Again, I want to be candid with the committee. We examine the record rather more carefully to see whether they were rather passive and quiescent members of the organization or really active to see, when they have been here a year or two and begun to get established, whether they ought to be deported.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Would the Yugoslav regime not give Canada some facilities for finding out the same thing about Yugoslavs?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It would not?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, I think I had better say no, Mr. Cameron, and stop there.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Then I notice, Mr. Minister—I do not want to attempt to trip you up—but I notice you and your predecessor in answering letters on this thing have both mentioned the government is considering providing more facilities in Yugoslavia. Is there some idea that conditions are changing there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Hope springs eternal, Mr. Cameron.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could you elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I cannot. If we were really satisfied that more facilities would be productive from the over-all standpoint I think we would establish them. But, here I would like to make one general observation. I do not think that the Parliament of Canada established this department and the taxpayers provided this rather considerable amount of money for us to attempt to establish very expensive facilities to give the most minute examination to marginal cases. The purpose of the Immigration Department is, as Mr. Mackenzie King said—if I may mention his name—to increase the population of Canada by immigration. We think that the best use we can make of that money is to spend most of it in those countries where we can get immigrants of the kind we want, about whom we have not got these doubts with the greatest ease. The real reason we have spent quite considerable sums of money and an enormous amount of my own and my predecessor's

energies and the energies of senior officials in the department on these marginal cases is purely humanitarian. I am not asking for any sympathy, but I spend, I would say, 90 per cent of the time I am considering the administration of the Immigration Department on these marginal cases that are not, no matter how resolved, really going to add substantially to the population of Canada. Now, I do it because I think in a country with the kind of generous liberal views of human relations we have in this country it is what the people of Canada expect me to do, but I think I should make it clear that is not the real purpose of the Immigration Department.

Mr. BYRNE: I think that the matter brought up by yourself is a very important one. Some year or two ago the western nations took some satisfaction in the realization that large numbers of people were coming from behind the iron curtain to western Germany. Now, I saw a news despatch a few days ago that there was up to 10,000 or more leaving monthly and returning to behind the iron curtain. I know those two years are important, but tens of thousands of people did not come to western Germany with the intention of migrating to western nations for doubtful purposes. If we could give a little more liberal consideration to these people I think that the risk would be very small in the danger of bringing in undesirables. They must be people who were looking for freedom and are now being forced to return to what they left.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I did not see the news report to which you refer. Did you gather that these were mostly non-Germans?

Mr. BYRNE: People from behind the iron curtain.

The CHAIRMAN: I took it that they were non-German because the west German government has done a marvelous job of looking after people of German origin. I took it that it was these people who escaped through the iron curtain and tried to exist in west Germany and found it very hard.

Mr. BYRNE: It has an adverse effect on our propaganda.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can sympathize with the point, but I would be rather surprised if you and Mr. Tucker have all the facts. I think what is really happening in the main is that, in spite of what the west German government has been able to do—and it has been quite heroic—there are a lot of these people who just cannot adapt themselves to a new environment. After all, these people are people who have lived perhaps on one piece of land for generations and they just go back in spite of everything, and I would be awfully surprised if the greater part of this number were not Germans and, in fact, Germans who would not even think of coming to Canada because even west Germany is too strange for them.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to express an opinion on exactly the same matter. I think that the two-year provision is perhaps a little too harsh. I wish the minister and the department would give consideration to cutting it to say six monhs or something like that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will be very glad to discuss this with my colleagues, particularly the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Justice. It is not something which the minister could do on his own responsibility.

Mr. FULTON: Has I.R.O. definitely finished its activities in west Germany?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I.R.O. has not existed since 1952.

Mr. FULTON: Are there no refugee camps of an international nature, apart from those provided by the west German government, to which people may go for this waiting period?

The CHAIRMAN: Do some of the churches not maintain camps?

Mr. FORTIER: They would be under the German government.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to ask what facilities there are for applicants from Central American and these small countries particularly as regards possibly original European nationals who are now living there and wishing to come into Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think before that question is answered Mr. Starr is entitled to an answer to his question which he has been waiting for for some time. I am going to ask the Director of Immigration to answer Mr. Starr's question which as I recollect it is: I would like a description of what happens to an applicant when he presents himself at, say, Karisruhe— picking a place at random—and what happens from then on until he gets to, say, Oshawa.

Mr. SMITH: There are two kinds of applicants who apply. One is the sponsored case from Canada. He is called in for examination at our office overseas when our official there receives a form from Canada giving the outline as to the settlement arrangements that are available. This applies only to sponsored or close relative cases. There are exceptional cases where an employer who requires and knows the qualifications of an individual may apply for this individual and he is dealt with in the same manner as the close relatives. Then, there is the case that is dealt with for open placement. He generally applies, either in person or in writing or is referred to our office by some of the voluntary organizations or through other ways, and is then examined upon furnishing a written application outlining his qualifications, he is called in for an interview at a stated period. He then is questioned carefully regarding his civil status. If that is satisfactory, he is then referred to the medical section and goes through the medical examination. If he is successful with his civil and his medical examination he is then granted a visa upon establishing that he has transportation arranged and that the sailing date has been determined. This is the general practice throughout continental Europe, I should say.

In the United Kingdom, of course, the immigrants come and apply wherever they may reside and are examined in some instances by roster doctors which are distributed throughout the United Kingdom and others come direct to our office where we have all the facilities for their examination both medically and civilly.

Once the visa is given and the transportation assured, they then come forward and on arrival at the port of embarkation they are examined. This is more or less a cursory examination to see if any illness has developed since the original medical examination took place in Europe.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe you mean the port of debarkation?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, I am sorry. I did mean to say the port of debarkation.

Following this, the sponsored cases are directed to the sponsor in Canada. If they are unsponsored cases or open placement ones, they are sent to various points throughout Canada as indicated at the time of their applying for admission to this country and where their services are required as revealed by a survey which has been made by our Canadian field staff and where the best opportunities exist for their placement.

They are then dealt with in Canada by Immigration placement officers who are regular Immigration officers or are dealt with by the services of the National Employment Service. We as Immigration officers assist the National Employment Service in cases where the immigrants are difficult to place and we take the responsibility of assisting them in obtaining work whenever possible. We do not guarantee specific positions to the unsponsored cases even in the lines in which they are qualified. We endeavour however to see that they are placed in employment in fields where they have the most experience and for which they have best been trained.

After arrival here the Immigration officers assist in finding temporary accommodation for them. Some are found houses to rent but few. Most of them are destined to go places where there is likelihood of their getting immediate employment, as I mentioned before, and are referred to places where they can get reasonable rent for a short period and usually after the first pay day they are able to look after themselves. Does that answer the question?

Mr. STARR: I have a few questions to ask in that respect, Mr. Smith. Their qualifications for entry depend mainly on two points, health and civil status as you mentioned?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. STARR: And by that I gather you mean the political screening of his past?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. STARR: In most cases where a proposed immigrant has been refused admission to Canada because of his health, is he told he must wait a period of six months if a certain aspect of his health may be cleared up?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If it is remediable. But if it is incurable, then of course they are not told.

Mr. STARR: Yes, I understand that. In a case of screening where an immigrant is simply told that he is not allowed into this country and that is all and no actual or definite reason is given for it, do you feel there is some harm in telling a person that he is refused admission to Canada because of his political activity?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Starr, I think in the first place you are limiting the field far too much. I am sure that there are as many people turned down because they have criminal records of the ordinary common garden variety of crimes as are turned down for security reasons. In checking the civil status we check to see if they have been convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude. We check to see if they have ever been in a mental institution. Although you might perhaps regard that as health it is not something which is established in the medical examination. We check to find out if they belong to those long lists of people such as prostitutes and so on, who are prohibited. I think there might be some risk to our officials, in telling the applicant why he is refused. These applications are made in countries other than Canada. If an applicant presented herself and we stated that we would not allow her in because she was a prostitute we might have our officers in the courts of that country all the time being faced with charges of libel and slander. That is just a practical difficulty.

Mr. FULTON: I do not think it is one which exists at all. I do not want to enter upon a discussion of this at the moment and I am not an expert on international law but this is a problem that would not exist if it took place in the embassy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Our officers are not in the embassy.

Mr. FULTON: I do not think it would be regarded as libel. There is no publication and it would be impossible to say that it is libelous.

Mr. STARR: I wish to follow up something which Mr. Smith has said. I asked if the same procedure was being followed in the South American countries such as Brazil and Argentine in respect to immigrants from displaced persons camps who have gone there because they were admitted to those countries prior to any other country. Perhaps they have relatives in Canada and wish to migrate and join them here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to answer that question. I think Mr. Monteith's question is along the same line and I am afraid this will have to

be the last answer today. The answer to that question is that we have never considered that we ought to compete with other countries of immigration. We do not provide any unnecessary facilities in Australia or in the South American countries or in Israel because those countries are trying to attract immigrants too. And we do not think that we ought to go to those countries, trying to get their immigrants to leave, because we would resent it if they came here and tried to take the immigrants we have got here, from this country.

Mr. STARR: The United States does.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I do not think the United States makes any effort to do it.

Mr. THATCHER: But they seem to succeed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Our feeling is that we should not waste the taxpayer's money to provide any special facilities for the very small number of people who are in those countries who happen to have relatives here who want them to come. Once again, we do what we can when we can, because they have these relatives here, but it is not part of our immigration policy. Indeed, it is rather contrary to it.

Mr. MONTEITH: What do you do when you say "You do what you can when you can"?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have no regular immigration officers at Caracas or Rio de Janiero or any of these other South American capitals and we do not think we ought to.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is any opportunity open for these people at any time?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: From time to time their relatives provide sufficient evidence to satisfy us; but we do not think the Canadian government should provide special facilities to deal with this very small number of cases.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Can they not apply to our embassies there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh yes.

Mr. GARLAND: You mentioned a survey conducted by the department in connection with these cases, a survey of persons who come forward on their own, the open placements. Would you mind enlarging on that survey? What methods do you use?

Mr. SMITH: We obtain information from our field staff early in the fall. They are familiar with their particular areas. They report the probable opportunities in their respective regions. That information is then sent in and centralized here. Early in the fall, let us say in September, we obtain what we consider is a reasonably full estimate of what the requirements will be in the coming year; and then we supplement that information with monthly reports as to changes in the economic situation in their particular areas. The result is that that information is sent overseas and we see that certain occupations and certain numbers of workers should be sent to the area which has indicated a need for their services.

Mr. GARLAND: Is that done entirely within your own department, or are there other facilities of government involved?

Mr. SMITH: It is done within our own department first, although that information is utilized in discussions with other organizations and departments before final analysis is made; and the program is decided and projected on all sources of information that are available to us.

Mr. NESBITT: Could you provide for us at the next meeting a typical set of questions that immigrants are asked with regard to their civil status?

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask too for the forms that are used.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall be tabling them in response to an application for them, at 2.30 in the afternoon or so soon thereafter as I can get it.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be a good thing to have them as part of the record of this committee.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean just the current set?

Mr. MICHENER: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should not want to have to provide all the old ones because I think the stock has practically run out.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now time for us to adjourn. What is the feeling of the committee? The minister was wondering whether he should bring his officials with him in regard to citizenship on Monday. Or do you think we are likely to be spending Monday on immigration?

Mr. THATCHER: Let us finish with immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought you might run out of material.

Mr. THATCHER: Oh no, no.

The CHAIRMAN: Then shall we adjourn now until 10:30 on Monday?

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, do you not think that 11:00 o'clock would be much more convenient? 11:00 to 1:00; because 10:30 means that we do not get into our correspondence before we have to come bustling down here.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, about half the committee are gone; and up until now I thought we had decided on 10:30. If there is to be a change, I think that we should have the whole committee agree to it.

Mr. FULTON: I am sorry. I was not aware that there had been a firm decision to meet at 10:30 each day. Was that already decided?

The CHAIRMAN: I gathered that the majority consensus of the committee was that we should meet each day at 10:30. But there may be some people who would like to change it. So I suggest that we meet on Monday at 10:30 and then if there is a wish expressed for a change in the time we can discuss it then.

APPENDIX "A"

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION
IMMIGRATION BRANCH

Statements for the Calendar Year 1954

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, BY RACIAL ORIGIN FROM OVERSEAS AND TOTAL FROM THE UNITED STATES

	Calendar Year 1953	Calendar Year 1954	Percentages of Increase or Decrease
English	28,325	26,714	....
Irish	7,562	6,438	....
Scottish	10,344	10,480	....
Welsh	846	961	....
Totals	47,077	44,593	— 5
United States	9,379	10,110	+ 8
North European			
Austrian	3,574	3,841	....
Belgian	1,431	1,328	....
Danish	1,562	1,399	....
Dutch	20,472	16,340	....
Finnish	1,232	697	....
French	3,136	2,813	....
German	35,015	29,845	....
Icelandic	53	39	....
Norwegian	939	993	....
Swedish	435	306	....
Swiss	826	961	....
Totals	68,675	58,562	— 15

	Calendar Year 1953	Calendar Year 1954	Percentages of Increase or Decrease
Others			
Albanian	14	25	....
Arabian	17	14	....
Armenian	70	68	....
Bulgarian	54	48	....
Chinese	1,929	1,950	....
Czechoslovakian	543	295	....
East Indian	139	175	....
Estonian	451	290	....
Greek	2,059	2,892	....
Hebrew	3,583	1,334	....
Iranian	18	10	....
Italian	24,293	24,595	....
Japanese	46	71	....
Jugoslavian	1,999	1,541	....
Lettish	550	456	....
Lithuanian	278	246	....
Magyar	858	502	....
Maltese	745	935	....
Mexican	6	4	....
Negro	167	167	....
Polish	3,176	2,274	....
Portuguese	555	1,324	....
Roumanian	269	214	....
Russian	485	355	....
Spanish	257	207	....
Syrian	190	233	....
Turkish	35	25	....
Ukrainian	908	692	....
Others	43	20	....
Totals	43,737	40,962	— 6
Grand Totals	168,868	154,227	— 9

Immigration to Canada for the Calendar Year 1954 compared with that of the Calendar Year 1953

	British	From U.S.A.	1953 Northern European Races	Other Races	Totals
January	1,576	747	1,525	1,779	5,627
February	1,505	702	1,493	1,542	5,242
March	3,286	794	5,439	2,549	12,068
April	5,849	814	7.035	2,420	16,118
May	6,529	899	8,872	4,605	20,905
June	5,277	381	8,362	4,356	18,376
July	4,793	779	10,261	3,864	19,697
August	3,593	678	5,825	4,498	14,594
September	3,165	994	5,055	3,257	12,471
October	4,817	1,008	7,701	5,098	18,624
November	4,261	832	4,262	4,561	13,916
December	2,426	751	2,845	5,208	11,230
Totals	47,077	9,379	68,675	43,737	168,868

	British	From U.S.A.	1954 Northern European Races	Other Races	Totals
January	2,654	750	2,182	2,494	8,080
February	1,731	633	1,961	2,509	6,834
March	3,497	775	4,267	4,770	13,309
April	5,363	714	7,131	3,446	16,654
May	7,326	772	9,636	5,344	23,078
June	5,368	914	7,577	3,951	17,810
July	4,473	967	6,662	3,737	15,839
August	3,187	708	6,571	3,804	14,270
September	2,512	1,326	4,577	2,564	10,979
October	3,976	996	3,747	2,537	11,256
November	3,199	859	2,114	2,492	8,664
December	1,307	696	2,137	3,314	7,454
Totals	44,593	10,110	58,562	40,962	154,227

	Percentages of Increase or decrease
January	+ 44
February	+ 30
March	+ 10
April	+ 3
May	+ 10
June	— 3
July	— 20
August	— 2
September	— 12
October	— 40
November	— 38
December	— 34
Total	— 9

Immigration to Canada showing Sex, Occupational Groups and Destination
Calendar Year 1954

SEX	
Adult Males	64,551
Ault Females	51,690
Children under 18	37,986
Total	154,227
OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS	
Gainfully Occupied	
Managerial	1,633
Professional	8,350
Clerical	6,775
Transportation	1,553
Communication	385
Commercial	2,561
Financial	174
Service	11,974
Agricultural	10,920
Fishing, Trapping and Logging	335
Mining	428
Manufacturing, Mechanical and Construction	25,699
Labourers	13,011
Others	578
Total	84,376

Not Gainfully Occupied	
Dependent Wives	28,897
Dependent Children	35,503
Others	5,451
Total	69,851

DESTINATION	
Newfoundland	524
Nova Scotia	2,207
New Brunswick	1,011
Prince Edward Island	107
Quebec	28,419
Ontario	83,029
Manitoba	9,219
Saskatchewan	4,125
Alberta	13,294
British Columbia	12,197
Yukon and Northwest Territories	95

Immigration to Canada by Age Groups and Sex
Calendar Year 1954

Age Groups	Totals	Males	Females
0–14	33,098	17,222	15,876
15–19	11,307	6,475	4,832
20–24	29,033	16,444	12,589
25–29	29,072	17,080	11,992
30–39	29,818	16,708	13,110
40–49	13,718	7,393	6,325
50–59	5,159	2,180	2,979
60 and over	3,022	1,029	1,993
Totals	154,227	81,531	69,696

Returned Canadians from the United States for the Calendar Year 1954, compared with the Calendar Year 1953

	1953	1954
January	307	215
February	303	266
March	394	409
April	419	416
May	370	495
June	511	530
July	382	460
August	464	418
September	455	415
October	450	331
November	277	306
December	274	255
Totals	4,606	4,516

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament
1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 3

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

WITNESSES:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955

54136—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. Tucker, Esq., and Messrs.

Benidickson	Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)	Michener
Byrne	Hellyer	Monteith
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)	Henry	Nesbitt
Cannon	Jutras	Power (*St. John's West*)
Decore	Lafontaine	Starr
Deschatelets	MacEachen	Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Dupuis	MacNaughton	Thatcher
Fulton	McLeod	Yuill—26
Garland		

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, February 28, 1955.

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Decore, Dupuis, Fulton, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, McLeod, Monteith, Nesbitt, Power (*St. John's West*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Honourable J. W. Pickersgill, Minister; Colonel Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

The Minister and his officials supplied information requested at previous meetings and were questioned thereon.

Item number 59 was allowed to stand.

Item number 66—Administration of the Immigration Act—was called and discussed.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Tuesday, March 1, 1955.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

54136—1½

EVIDENCE

MONDAY, February 28, 1955.

10.30 A.M.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, will you please come to order.

Hon. JOHN W. PICKERSGILL (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chairman, there were one or two questions which were left over from our last meeting. Concerning the information asked for by Mr. Fulton I find that I only have one copy here. I could read it now and bring additional copies tomorrow.

Mr. FULTON: Would you do that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The question asked was the number of emigrants from Canada to the United States during the period 1945 to June 1954. I have here the number of emigrants from Canada to the United States for the United States fiscal year, July 1, to June 30 during the period 1945 to 1954:

Year	*Total*
1945	11,079
1946	20,434
1947	23,467
1948	24,788
1949	24,516
1950	21,885
1951	25,880
1952	33,354
1953	36,283
1954	34,873
Total	256,559

These are taken, for the period 1945 to 1950, from a Dominion Bureau of Statistics report which quotes the United States immigration and naturalization service as the source thereof. The figures for 1951 to 1954 were taken from a report prepared by the statistical branch of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. FULTON: May I ask the minister if these figures are those of people who are going down there for employment? Do they include all people, or would there perhaps be some modifications to be made, for instance, if a head of a family goes down and settles and later on brings down his wife and children would the figures of the wife and children be included in these figures?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand those are all persons with Canadian citizenship having immigration visas or what is the equivalent in the United States to our immigration visas. It does not include Canadian visitors, but all persons with the intention of residing in the United States.

Mr. FULTON: Whether or not they take up employment?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, if they go down to California to live because they are old or to stay for any reason.

Mr. DUPUIS: These are emigrants going from Canada to the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: These are Canadian citizens, not necessarily Canadian born.

Mr. FULTON: Do you have the period of time those people stay in the United States permanently or temporarily?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. You would have to trace each individual person in order to obtain any information that would be of any value in order to show for the ten-year period the number of Canadians who have returned to Canada. That would be a very difficult thing to do. I do not know that we make a distinction on their return as to whether the person has gone down on an immigration visa or as a visitor.

Mr. C. E. S. SMITH (Director of Immigration): It must be established that he has gone down for permanent entry; gone down for permanent residence.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would not personally rely too much on our statistics for those returning. Wo do not cross question Canadians very much when they come back.

Mr. FULTON: Do we have any statistics of those returning after having taken out immigration visas to the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do ask the question.

Mr. FULTON: Those who are shown as immigrants from the United States, 9,379 for 1953 and 10,110 for 1954?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. It is on page 5: returned Canadians from the United States for the calendar year 1954 compared with the calendar year 1953.

Mr. FULTON: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would think those figures are probably a little on the low side because I suspect that some Canadians coming back are not particularly keen about saying they went down there to stay and that they just say I am a Canadian, and they possess evidence that they are.

Mr. DUPUIS: I wonder if I may obtain some other information. Could somebody tell us the number of immigrants that came to Canada during the same years 1945 to 1954?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Last year it was 154,000. Of course the years are not the same. The American year goes from the 1st of July to the 30th of June and our statistics are for calendar years. It was 154,000 last year and in 1953 168,000.

Mr. DUPUIS: For the same period, 1945 to 1954, could we have the figures of the number of people who came in during those years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it is in the annual report. It is somewhere between 1 million and 1,200,000.

Mr. BYRNE: We had a net loss to the United States of about 24,000 last year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would be something like that.

Mr. THATCHER: It would not be that large.

Mr. BYRNE: About 20,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any other question on this point?

Mr. DUPUIS: I asked a question.

The CHAIRMAN: About the same point?

Mr. DUPUIS: The number of immigrants who came to Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Immigrants from all sources, between 1 million and 1,200,000 since the war.

Mr. MONTEITH: These people coming in, according to this list we received this morning, are they showing any indication as to taking out citizenship papers? Are there any figures which would show how many over the years would take out citizenship papers in Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We were talking about the number of Canadians who went to the United States and the number of Canadians who came back to Canada, so the question would not arise, Mr. Monteith.

Mr. MONTEITH: But, I am curious as to how many of these people coming from the States—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The American immigrant?

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think the deputy minister might answer that question. You were the one who gave the figure the other day about Alberta?

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have some statistics on that.

Mr. FORTIER: The only way we could check the number of Americans who are in Alberta is through the census of 1951; and of that date it was discovered that there were 55,504 persons who claimed to have been born in the United States who were residing in the Province of Alberta.

Of this number 10,673 indicated their allegiance to the United States. That is the information we got from the census. We do not have any other record.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, there was the other one.

Mr. FORTIER: The question as to the number of positions in the administrative branch of the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, Mr. Thatcher's question, having to do with that since the beginning of the department.

Mr. FORTIER: I am indicating here the growth of the administration branch from 1950 to 1955. You suggested 1949, but the department was not created until 1950.

To begin: the number of positions authorized in the estimates for 1950-1951 was 37; then it was increased in 1951-1952 to 62; and in 1952-1953 to 67; and 1953-1954 to 81; and in 1954-1955 to 92; and in 1955-1956 to 134.

The explanation is this: to avoid duplication of staffside functions common to all branches of the department, certain divisions have been placed in the administrative branch. This enables us to keep our costs down, but, at the same time, to maintain a satisfactory performance level in the division concerned.

The functions performed by these divisions are not new and were performed in the branches before the department was created. They have gradually been transferred to the administrative branch during the past four or five years.

For example, the personnel division which serves the entire department was established as a division of the administrative branch in 1951-1952. At that time, the division was handling personnel work for branches outside of the immigration service, such as citizenship, citizenship registration, and other divisions of the administrative division. The most recent adjustment took place two years ago when the personnel records unit for the Indian Affairs branch was transferred to the division.

The resulting decreases in the establishments of the other branches are not necessarily apparent as there have been changes in the organization of these branches since the department was created. On the other hand, the size of each branch would be larger if these services had remained in the branches,

and the size of the department would probably be greater as it would be difficult to provide the same services for each branch independently with the same number of people that we presently employ.

The explanation of increases by divisions is as follows: in the minister's office in 1950-51 there were 6 positions on the establishment while today there are 9. This is due to the increase of work in the minister's office.

In the deputy minister's office the number of positions in 1950-1951 were 11 and they are still 11, in the estimates of 1955-1956.

In the microfilming and duplicating division there were none in 1950-1951, while today there are 5 in the present estimates. Four of those positions were transferred from the Citizenship and Registration branch. These positions had been used for a microfilming unit in that branch alone, and it was decided that the service should be extended to the entire department. One additional position was transferred to the unit from another section of the administrative branch.

As to the legal division, there were two positions in 1950-1951 and there are three in the estimates for 1955-1956.

There is a decrease of one stenographic position in the purchasing division. There were 8 on the establishments in 1950-1951 while there are 7 in the establishment as of 1955-1956.

As to stationery and supplies, there were 3 in the 1950-1951 estimates while there are 10 in the estimates today. In 1951-1952 six positions were transferred from the Immigration branch to provide a central stationery and supplies unit; and in 1953-1954 one position was transferred from the personnel division.

In the editorial and information division there were 5 positions in 1950-1951 while there are 9 in the present estimates.

Two new positions in the editorial and information division were established in 1953-54

We also increased the number of stenographers. There were two of them transferred from the Immigration branch who are now in the personnel division. Personnel Division: there were 2 in 1950-1951 and there are 39 in 1955-1956.

Perhaps I should explain that a little further. In 1950-1951 when the department was formed two stenographic positions were allocated for use by the proposed personnel division. In 1951-1952 sixteen positions were transferred to the division from the Immigration branch. These positions had been formerly used to provide the personnel service for immigration. One stenographic position was dropped from the establishment. In 1952-1953 one junior clerical and one stenographic position was added to the establishment after a review of the organization by the Civil Service Commission. In 1953-1954 due to an increase in the volume of work an extra stenographic position was added to the establishment. In 1954-1955, following an organization and methods survey and a classification study by the Civil Service Commission, the division was reorganized and 6 new positions were added to the establishment. These positions were approved to provide the nucleus for a district personnel officer establishment, and to provide additional assistance at the administrative and clerical levels. Two additional positions were transferred from the Indian Affairs personnel records unit to provide for the gradual transfer of the Indian Affairs personnel function to the division.

In 1955-56 four additional positions were added to the division to handle the increase in work resulting from the new Superannuation Act. Two additional stenographic positions were transferred from the Indian Affairs branch, and five minor clerical and stenographic positions were established to provide for the extra volume of personnel records work.

Now, as to trainees, they are now under personnel, but I will deal with them separately. Of course, we had none in 1950-51. The first trainees we had under personnel was in 1953-54 and they were six. In 1954-55 they were increased to 9, and in 1955-56 they have been increased to 17. And I might add here, that these positions for trainees are to take the place of all vacancies as they are occurring on the establishment.

According to figures of the Metropolitan Insurance Company as to the rate of death according to age, we would expect to have a net loss in the coming year of 4, and we have already found from experience that there was a turnover of about 13 and that will be taken care of out of the 17, but I must say to the committee in all honesty, that it is just by coincidence that these figures happen to be the same as the number of trainees.

A number of people will retire from the service, whom we have to replace. In addition others take promotion in other departments, and we have also promotion within our own department.

There are also in the estimates of 1955-56 four positions for an inspectional service. This is a new division as far as this department is concerned. The branches were conducting in the field certain types of inspections. However, there is a need for inspection at the administrative level to have a better view from the field efficiency to see how the procedure is being implemented, what administrative changes could be made and how a more efficient procedure could be established.

Finally, there are the technical services, which we discussed the other day. There are 20 positions, and, of course, there were none in 1950-51. In establishing this division, we transferred the man who is director of this service from the deputy minister's staff. There is a stenographer who has been transferred from the Immigration branch. We now have a librarian, who is under the technical services and looks after all the purchases of books for the various branches of the department. There are a library clerk and a stenographer, who have been transferred from the editorial and information division.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In addition to the statistical unit.

Mr. THATCHER: Of course, I cannot analyze that yet, but, as I understand it from Colonel Fortier, it is a fact that your staff in this particular branch has gone from 37 in 1950-51. It was 14 in 1949-50 according to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But the department did not exist at all. It had to be put together after it was established on the 18th of January, 1950.

Mr. THATCHER: Even if we accept that, it has gone from 37 to 134 in four years. One of the explanations you have given, Colonel, if I understand you correctly, is that many of the personnel have been transferred from other departments.

Mr. FORTIER: Branches.

Mr. THATCHER: My answer to that is that your other departments also have had large increases in personnel. If they had just come from administration, they should have been taken out of the other ones. I notice, for instance, that your Citizenship branch, the third one listed in the estimates, has jumped from 32 to 46 in the years under consideration. Some of your departments are down but others are up quite sharply; for instance, your field and inspectional service abroad has gone up from 131 to 417 in the five years we are discussing. I notice that in this actual year your total staff in Immigration is to be 2,302 as compared with 2,217 a year ago. That means that your whole staff has increased by 85. The question that I am concerned with is that at the time when your immigration trend is downward the staff keeps going up and up.

Mr. FORTIER: All the staff you mention is not necessarily for Immigration.

Mr. THATCHER: It is listed in your Immigration estimates. I have not included Indian Affairs, but I have taken your own figures.

Mr. FORTIER: If you are taking the Immigration figures in the estimates, there is the five-day week to be taken into consideration, and it certainly takes more staff to look after the immigrants as they arrive. For instance, this year, contrary to the year before, instead of establishing an immigrant within a few days or, say, 48 hours, as was the rule in the past, we take an average of 10 days. That requires more work and more people.

Mr. THATCHER: I can see that.

Mr. FORTIER: We had to take care of the five-day week. The traffic at the border has increased.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Then there is another factor, Mr. Thatcher. We do not cease to take an interest in the immigrants when they have arrived and have got a job for the first time. Every year we have added on an average at least 150,000, that is about a million in the last seven or eight years. This results in an accumulation of problems of one kind or another that makes a good deal more work.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): How closely do you follow up the careers of these people?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are constantly being accused of following them up too closely and deporting them.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Individual cases.

Mr. THATCHER: It looks to me as though this departmental administration is getting top heavy as compared with previous years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Do you not think that it would be fairer to take the total figure for the department? I suggested to the administration officer that, as soon as he can add it up, he give us the total for 1951 for the personnel in this department and compare it with the figure for this year. As the deputy minister has pointed out, you have this inspectional service, which is a wholly new branch this year. It does not really replace anything in any of the branches; it is an innovation. Outside of that, there are these trainees. The reason why they are perhaps rather larger in number is that over a very long period during the thirties immigration was practically allowed to run down, and this occurred also during the war, and the result was that the staff of the Immigration branch —and the same was true of the Indian Affairs branch during the war—became abnormally old. We are faced with the quite serious problem of replacement of relatively senior personnel. This trainee figure has jumped very rapidly, and I think it is to meet this special problem. Outside of that, I think that the only way in which you can get a proper picture of the growth of the administrative branch is to have the whole picture of the department, because what really happened in the history of the department was this. When this department was put together in 1950, two branches of the then Mines and Resources department were taken into it: the Immigration branch and the Indian Affairs branch. I do not think that any of my predecessors would object to my saying that the Indian Affairs branch was rather an orphan. The Immigration branch was really the nucleus of the new department. There was no Departmental Administration at all on the day the department was started. It was really zero. I should not say that; there was the deputy minister. But outside of that the rest of the administrative staff was clutched out of various branches, mostly from the Immigration branch; and the Citizenship and Citizenship Registration branches came from the Secretary of State's department. They had no previous connection with this department at all. That is why the only figures that are valid are the 1950-51 figures, because by that time an attempt had been made to create a departmental administration branch.

Mr. THATCHER: You say that you have a purchasing department. Is that for Indian Affairs and Citizenship? You have the one purchasing department?

Mr. FORTIER: One division for that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That does not include construction.

Mr. FORTIER: That does not include the construction.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Construction is exclusively Indian Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Just what does the department do with regard to immigrants in the years subsequent to their entry? We have many immigrants in our riding and I have not yet come across a case of any fatherly interest.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we come to that, let us deal with one item at a time. We have had the question of the increase in numbers of employees in the administration. Why can we not go on and get the number in the department as a whole in 1950-51 as compared with 1955-56, and then, when we get the increase in numbers, find out the reason for the increase, what the increase in cost has been due to this and to the increases in salaries and then what the increases in cost have been from the change to the five-day week? Let us assign those particular things to their proper places and significance, and then we can look at it from an over-all viewpoint.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I now have these broad general figures, but perhaps even before that we should deal with Mr. Cameron's question relating to the Immigration branch. I wonder if the committee feels that we have now reached the point in this discussion where we could deal with one branch at a time, and we could concentrate on the administration branch until we have finished with it.

Mr. FULTON: I have another question on the departmental administration.

Mr. THATCHER: You had another question you were going to answer me, Mr. Minister. You recall, (on page one of your brief) you were going to give me a breakdown of each of those countries and tell me what your migration policy is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not ready to do that yet. I will not forget about it. Here are the figures that I have suggested to Mr. Thatcher ought to be the real basis of any judgment whether the personnel is increasing abnormally. The total figure for the department in 1950-51 was 3,039 and the number we are asking parliament to vote salaries for this year is 3,954 which is an increase of 915. Now that increase includes 340 additional teachers for Indian schools, over and above the number there were in 1950-1951. So that I think it can be said that the real increase was 575.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder if the hon. minister could give us some figure which relates only to the Immigration branch.

The CHAIRMAN: First of all, Mr. Thatcher, you asked a question about departmental administration and the explanation given is that there have been transfers back and forth.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not back. They are all forward.

The CHAIRMAN: But in any event we are trying now to find out the over-all picture, and after doing that we may go back to the other matter. Let us follow this right to the end if we can. We have an increase of 915 in the department, of which number 340 relates to school teachers taken on for the Indians. That brings the number down to 575. What is the explanation with regard to that? It seems to me that we should pursue these things right down the list until we have that explanation.

Mr. BYRNE: Since 1951 there has been an increase of about 900 in the staff. That consists of teachers.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I have misled you a little Mr. Byrne. We are paying, or are prepared to pay, 1,005 teachers this year in Indian schools.

The CHAIRMAN: How many were there in 1950-1951.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: 537.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the difference then?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: 468. The number 340 is the increase this year over last year. There has been an increase of 468 since 1950-1951.

The CHAIRMAN: 537. That is 468 of an increase.

Mr. FULTON: Would the hon. minister please complete his sentence.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not quite sure yet what is the right figure for the number of teachers, but a high proportion are teachers in Indian schools.

Mr. THATCHER: May we have a breakdown of the total staff of the department of Immigration, including these Immigration figures.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Thatcher means the department of Citizenship.

Mr. THATCHER: On page 12. Leave Indian Affairs out of it. A breakdown for each of the five years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not see how we can do that and give a true picture. We are discussing departmental administration and the administration has just as much responsibility for Indian Affairs as it has for Immigration, and I would not like anybody to think we do not have a departmental administrative service for all branches equally.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the suggestion is a good one. We shall ask the deputy minister to give us a prepared statement of the figures of the department in 1950-51 and the number of positions asked to be provided in 1955-56 in the whole department, and then to explain the increase. It is due in part to the increase in the number of teachers to the extent of 568. Then there may be some other technical services which were engaged. That will explain the necessity for further increases, and then there is the increased work with regard to inspection and so on. That is exactly what I think this committee wants—an explanation for the increase whatever it may be.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that is a perfectly proper thing for us to give.

The CHAIRMAN: When we have got that, if there is any particular branch which Mr. Thatcher wants to investigate further, such as Immigration or a sub branch of the department, it would be quite in order for him to proceed. I think myself it would be a good thing to ask the deputy minister to prepare this information for us when he may do so at greater leisure.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: An analysis of this kind is somewhat complex and when figures of this sort are asked for it is proper that some postponement should be sought.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that there will be the slightest difficulty in producing statistical tables for the whole department. However, the deputy minister reminds that there are only 24 hours in a day and we spend some of them here. It may not be possible to give an adequate and proper explanation of all the changes by tomorrow morning but we shall do the best we can.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest, too, that this statement of the number of employees be prepared in the form of a table which can be distributed and put in the appendix, because then it will be easier for the members to follow the facts given and also for hon. members of the House to appreciate the situation.

I suggest we go back now to the question by Mr. Cameron.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Can we not deal with this matter of departmental administration until we have disposed of all the questions relating to it which we can deal with today?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I wonder if the figures given for employees of the department include those who give legal advice in special circumstances?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean lawyers.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do we retain them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh no, we would not insult them by calling them employees.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Which is the department that retains them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are retained by the attorney general of Canada at our request. We pay the bill, but we cannot choose the lawyers.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Can the hon. minister add that to his list of questions, namely the cost since the department was opened of this extra legal advice which it was necessary to obtain?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You would like the breakdown for all the branches of the department—how much for the Immigration branch, how much for Indian Affairs and so on?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes please.

Mr. FULTON: While we are on that point under the departmental administration you might care to say which branch accounts form the most of the total for professional and special services for which this year you are asking over $3½ million. Would that be mainly medical work overseas? It seems to be a high total. It is found in the chart tabled with the estimates. Column 4 shows special and professional services for the department of $3,543,589. I do not wish to bring it up under the wrong branch. You might indicate to us where the main expense is and we will wait until we get there.

Mr. FORTIER: I have some figures here: Citizenship registration, 1,800; Citizenship branch, 8,200, Immigration branch, administration 25,000; field and inspectional service abroad, 10,500; Indian Affairs branch administration, 10,000; Indian agencies operation and maintenance 500; reserves and trusts 2,400. I am breaking down by division in each branch.

The CHAIRMAN: In dollars?

Mr. FORTIER: Dollars.

Mr. FORTIER: Indian welfare operation and maintenance 750; fur conservation, 12,300; Indian education, administration and general operation 20,000; Indian education day schools, 28,000; Indian education residential schools, 3,401,939.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Education is broken down into four items.

Mr. FORTIER: I have four items there. I will indicate the total in a moment. The total would be $3,449,939. That is for the education of Indian affairs. Then, for the B.C. services, 600; making a total for 1955-56 of 3,543,589. This is a decrease of 25,574 over the fiscal year 1954-55.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You will see it is practically all Indian education.

Mr. FULTON: And that is over and above the quite large number of teachers shown here as departmental staff?

Mr. FORTIER: That would include the per capita grants paid to the residential schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Does it not also include salaries of teachers.

Mr. FORTIER: No.

Mr. FULTON: That is over and above the 1,000 odd teachers you have on the departmental staff?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. The education of Indians is one of the biggest of our expenses in the department.

Mr. NESBITT: Regarding the departmental administration I see one legal advisor. Perhaps the deputy minister could give us an idea of what his duties are, because in this field I would rather imagine it is one of the more complicated fields of national law. Does this legal advisor give legal advice to the department on complicated questions like perhaps differences in citizenship status in other countries, or is advice sought from outside men more frequently?

Mr. FORTIER: He advises the branches. Again, there is one lawyer who is on the establishment of this department, but also we have from the Department of Justice a lawyer who is serving the department. So, in fact there are two lawyers serving the department full time, and advising the branches when required.

Mr. NESBITT: What I am getting at is this. His duties are that he advises generally on regular questions?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Some of the questions that must arise, I would think, would be extraordinarily complicated questions of private and international law. Does the department on occasion seek further advice than the advice given by the legal advisor either in the administration or in the Department of Justice?

Mr. FORTIER: We would go to the Department of Justice in those cases.

Mr. NESBITT: Are opinions ever sought on some of these questions of private and international law from counsel in Toronto or Montreal?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The law, of course, provides that no department of the government can go anywhere for legal advice outside of its ranks except to the Department of Justice. If you wished to ask that kind of a question it should be asked of the Minister of Justice when his estimates are up. It is illegal for us to go outside for legal advice.

Mr. NESBITT: If the problems are too much for the legal advisor or for the one assigned by the Department of Justice what happens?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We then ask the Deputy Minister of Justice for advice. Where he gets it is his business.

Mr. NESBITT: Do you in fact very often seek advice from the Deputy Minister of Justice on questions of private and international law?

Mr. FORTIER: Private and international law, yes, but international less. We may go to Justice occasionally for that.

Mr. NESBITT: On the questions of marital status, divorce and marriage questions which are complicated very often, are the opinions on that given mostly by the legal advisor of the department or do you call on the Justice department?

Mr. FORTIER: That is why we have on the staff a representative of the Department of Justice who is a direct contact with the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. NESBITT: You obtain the opinion from Justice rather than the legal advisor in the department?

Mr. FORTIER: Our legal advisor would give us a general opinion and if he wishes he can call on the representative from the Department of Justice. They work in adjoining offices.

Mr. NESBITT: The legal advisor is, I presume, a lawyer who has been practising for some time?

Mr. FORTIER: I would not say how long they have been practising, but you understand they are qualified lawyers, members of a bar in one of our provinces of Canada and one of them, for instance, has been with the civil service for many years.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does the Department of Citizenship and Immigration have to obtain the okay of the Department of Justice before it decides to appeal a case from one court to another, or do you do that on the advice of your own legal advisors?

Mr. FORTIER: We do consult the Department of Justice. They are the ones who tell us.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): If they tell you it would not be wise to appeal, that would be that?

Mr. FORTIER: If they tell us there are not valid grounds for appeal, we would not appeal.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): And you would always consult them?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In fact, by law, we cannot act without them.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister tell me what is the policy now with respect to these immigrants who have come into work for farmers for a certain period?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are we finished with the departmental administration? I assumed that as soon as we get to the Immigration branch any of these immigration questions could be cleared up. I was hoping we could go at this in an orderly way.

Mr. NESBITT: There is one further question I asked at the last committee meeting addressed to Mr. Smith. This may well come under Immigration. But, I asked if he would bring a list of the questions which are asked immigrants with respect to their civil status in European centres.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it would be preferable to save it.

Mr. FULTON: There is a question which has been intriguing me. I see that you have one chauffeur. What is he for?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The deputy minister can explain that. I am not sure that he has been hired yet.

Mr. FORTIER: Under the present arrangement, we have hired a truck to do our mail service such as collecting the mail, taking it to the post office, bringing it into various branches, as well as making deliveries of parcels for the department. A study of the situation has shown that if the department had its own vehicle, it would be less expensive to the public, because the contract has been going higher all the time. So what we are now proposing is to cancel our rental contract and to purchase a truck of our own. We are going to have our own truck and driver.

Mr. FULTON: This chauffeur is not necessarily a uniformed chauffeur who drives an expensive car? Would the minister mind appropriating his motor car allowance?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He certainly won't! The minister needs his motor car allowance to pay his taxi bills.

Mr. NESBITT: On departmental administration, there are a number of personnel officials listed in the department. What are their duties in detail?

Mr. FORTIER: You are looking at staff of the personnel division.

The CHAIRMAN: Departmental administration.

Mr. FORTIER: I tried to explain that when I gave the number of increases in the personnel division by the fact that we now have—and I explained that the other day—we have decided to have personnel officers in the field trying to decentralize the functions of personnel. These people are now on the staff in Ottawa being trained to go to the field.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think you comprehend accurately Mr. Nesbitt's question. It was: what do any of them do? Starting abinitio, what is the personnel division for.

Mr. FORTIER: The personnel division of course is to keep all records concerning staff in the department; to deal with the Treasury Board and the Civil Service Commission concerning classification and pay; to survey the establishment; to find out if more personnel is needed or less is needed; to sit occasionally—but not too occasionally—with the Civil Service Commission whenever there is a competition for the employment officers in the department; and they may sit on promotion competitions and so on.

Mr. NESBITT: Do these officers go out and do any inspection of branches in Canada or abroad?

Mr. FORTIER: Not abroad, as yet, but there is one officer who will be leaving this coming March to go abroad and make inspections there.

Mr. NESBITT: So we can say that they do inspection work of branches in Canada?

Mr. FORTIER: That is right, staff inspection.

Mr. NESBITT: In view of that answer I have one question I would like to ask. Do any of those officers keep an eye on the ships that are bringing immigrants to Canada?

Mr. FORTIER: It would be the immigration officer, not the personnel officer who would do that.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister tell me what his policy—or the department's policy—is in regard to the ownership of automobiles? Do you own any automobiles which the members of your staff use?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The departmental administration does not yet own any. But there is a proposal to buy one which will be a panel truck for its delivery service around Ottawa, which the deputy minister was speaking about. As to certain of the branches, we may speak of them when we come to each of them.

Mr. THATCHER: Would you at the next meeting or at some subsequent meeting give me a breakdown of the automobiles of your department anywhere in Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I presume you are using the word "breakdown" in a figurative sense.

Mr. THATCHER: Yes; we would like to have the figures.

The CHAIRMAN: What you mean is the number of passenger cars and trucks and panel trucks, and motors for the whole department?

Mr. THATCHER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Cameron.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am not sure whether this question should come here, but I wonder if the minister can give us a word as to what relationship there may be between the department and its branches overseas and private agencies which take an interest in immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is on immigration again.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There will be an appropriate item under immigration.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, practically all the questions which have been answered in the last fifteen minutes had to do with various sections of the department. Therefore if there are no questions on administration, why should we not pass it and get along?

Mr. FULTON: With respect to automobiles, do you keep an approved list for the purchase of automobiles?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think there is any such thing in the department.

Mr. FULTON: Then what is your policy in respect to the purchase of automobiles?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have not purchased any.

Mr. FULTON: Would all the departmental purchasing agents not have purchased motor vehicles?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean for the Indian Affairs branch?

Mr. FULTON: No. I mean for the department as a whole; any branch of it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a question I would be quite happy to answer along with this other question which Mr. Thatcher asked. The minister does not really know. There may have been one or two vehicles bought since I became minister but I do not know. It has not engaged my personal attention since I became minister. I would like to make certain inquiries before I attempted to answer.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: There is an order for a return before the House of Commons on that.

Mr. FULTON: Would you be good enough to make that inquiry and would you look into the question whether or not this department maintains an approved list of contractors or suppliers of motor vehicles?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on departmental administration?

Mr. MONTEITH: Is there any change in the accounting system proposed this year? I notice that there are some office operators hired or proposed for this year described as additional help, and also there is acquisition of equipment in the amount of $2,100. I wonder if they tied in at all?

Mr. FORTIER: Those are for the records in personnel. That is not for accounting purposes. If you want to find a man with certain qualifications, instead of going through two hundred files, for instance you can just punch it out.

Mr. MONTEITH: It does not have to do with the statistics branch?

Mr. FORTIER: No; it is not for the statistics branch.

Mr. MONTEITH: $25,000 was put in last year as an increase in the rate of pay. Was that for the whole year, or how many months did it cover?

Mr. FORTIER: That was for a general salary revision over the whole year.

Mr. MONTEITH: Did that pay increase start as of the first of April?

Mr. FORTIER: No, the first of December.

Mr. MONTEITH: The first of December of what year?

Mr. FORTIER: 1953.

Mr. MONTEITH: No, 1954-55; you mean the first of December, 1954.

Mr. FORTIER: December, 1953.

Mr. MONTEITH: Then it was in effect for the whole year 1954-55?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: This last year there was $2,400 put in for freight express-age and cartage. Why is there nothing in for this year?

Mr. FORTIER: Because we are acquiring a new vehicle. That is the reason for the decrease there.

Mr. MONTEITH: What about the increase in travelling expenses from $5,500 to $12,000?

Mr. FORTIER: Because there would be more personnel officers travelling plus the trainees, and there would be therefore greater expenses for travelling.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that the deputy minister should try to spare the minister. It is also somewhat farther from Bonavista to Ottawa than it is from Markdale to Ottawa. That has some little effect on the require-ments for travelling expenses too.

Mr. FULTON: Would the minister's travelling expenses from his con-stituency to his place of business, as it were, come under departmental administration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I lived in my constituency and travelled to Ottawa, I would be in exactly the same position as any other member of parliament. But it is known to all the committee that I am not living in my constituency; and outside of eight wonderful weeks which I spent there last summer, I have never lived in my constituency. But I do have occasion from time to time to go to Newfoundland on public business, and in cases like that the travelling expenses of the minister are quite properly expenditures which are chargeable to departmental travelling expenses.

Mr. FULTON: If the minister were going anywhere on public business, I would imagine that it would be a proper charge to the administration branch; however, if the minister is travelling to his constituency during the session or between sessions, surely he is not going there as minister but rather as a mem-ber of parliament; and surely, except upon official business, that would not be charged to the administration vote.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, the minister, or this particular minister in any event, has always and on every occasion when he has gone to Newfound-land had a great deal of public business to do.

Mr. FULTON: That is a very different thing from visits he may make to his home—but I do not want to quarrel about it, however I think it might be quite interesting.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I apologize to the committee for trying to be facetious and I recognize it is a mistake.

Mr. NESBITT: I see that the item for postage, $40, is the same for each year. The following item, "Telephones and Telegrams", is $4,500 this year as com-pared with $3,500 last year. It is my understanding that a certain amount of postage is charged to the department by the post office. Is that correct?

Mr. FORTIER: This mostly covers the stamps which are used after the closing of the mail room, for instance. Otherwise, all the mail going out, as you will see, comes under each branch item.

Mr. NESBITT: That $40 a year is for mail that goes out after hours?

Mr. FORTIER: On Saturday mornings, Sundays and holidays.

Mr. NESBITT: There is an increase of $1,000 for telephones and telegrams. That is due probably to the increased size in personnel and so on?

Mr. FORTIER: That is right, and the rates also.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, the rates have gone up. That is one difficulty.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder if Colonel Fortier could say whether the turnover of staff in the Immigration department is heavy. Right across your department, what percentage turnover would there be?

Mr. FORTIER: I do not have that.

Mr. THATCHER: Would it be 10 per cent?

Mr. FORTIER: I do not think that it would amount to a 10 per cent turnover. Of course, some personnel might go to other positions. That is not what you understand by turnover.

Mr. THATCHER: It would be less than 10 per cent? In a year, say, that would be 400 people at the most. Would you need 11 personnel officers to hire 400 people a year?

Mr. FORTIER: There is not only the hiring of personnel.

Mr. THATCHER: You said that you kept a record.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do not hire them at all. The Civil Service Commission hires them.

Mr. THATCHER: Then there would be even less reason to have eleven for such a small staff turnover. That would seem to be a department which is overstaffed. Am I wrong in asking that?

Mr. FORTIER: If you look at the personnel section as dealing only with the turnover of staff, it is the wrong approach, if I might suggest that. We have to deal with a number of letters coming from the staff for all sorts of explanations and so forth, which we have to look after. We are looking after the welfare of the staff, and that is one of the reasons why we are trying to decentralize so that we may be closer to the staff. There is a need for better estimation of the staff value. That is why we want to decentralize and have somebody close to the staff. The staff division is doing not only the record side of it but also the human side of staff work.

Mr. BENIDICKON: Promotions are part of their work.

Mr. FORTIER: Reclassification and so on. The Superannuation Act is causing a good deal of work this year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was going to make a suggestion to the committee. This seems to be a particular increase about which real concern has been expressed concern. I would be very glad to have the chief of the personnel division come here and let him answer questions directly as to what he really does, if the committee would be sufficiently interested. It might save the time of the committee in the long run, because I daresay much the same practice would be followed in all departments.

Mr. THATCHER: Could we wait until we get the breakdown and see what it indicates?

Mr. MONTEITH: The increase in travelling expenses seems to be sizeable. Could we get a breakdown on how the $12,000 is arrived at? What estimated figures go into it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have a sort of breakdown. Of course, the committee understands that we are not bound by this breakdown. The items are quite transferable, but we have to figure out some way to estimate what is needed. The minister is estimated at $2,000; the minister's staff, including his private secretary, about $3,000; the deputy minister, $650; the director of technical services, $700; the legal adviser, $500; the personnel division, $2,800; information services, $650; and the inspectional service, $1,500.

Mr. MONTEITH: You would not have the figure for last year, when you came up with an estimate of $5,500, so as to compare it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, I was not the minister and I do not know.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: The public accounts should show the disbursements for the period ending March last year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The expenditure for the full year 1953-54 was $4,830, and the expenditures up to October 31 of 1954-55 were $4,584. The real increase, as the deputy said a little while ago, is for personnel and inspectional services. It is the anticipated expenditure of the personnel and inspectional service that will be the big new bulge in it, so to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentlemen, on this question of administration?

Mr. MONTEITH: Does this "Acquisition of Equipment" refer to your new panel truck?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We will pass on. I think we understood that we were willing to take Immigration next. We will take some of the questions the committee wishes to ask on Immigration.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Is this item carried?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Subject to the answering of the questions that were left unanswered and to the further reservation that after these figures are produced, if Mr. Thatcher or any other member of the committee would like the chief of the personnel division to come and describe his duties, I am quite agreeable to having that done.

The CHAIRMAN: I felt that there was really no purpose in saying "carried", because there are these questions that have to be answered, and they may lead to further questions. No doubt we would have to open it up again.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is there any publicity at all in this department, or is that distributed among Immigration and so on?

Mr. FORTIER: The cost of publicity is distributed through the branches.

Mr. FULTON: I have a few questions on Departmental Administration. You expect to do more telephoning and telegraphing to the extent of $1,000 and to purchase office stationery, supplies and equipment to the extent of $2,000 more than last year. Is that based on the fact that last year you overspent the item beyond what you had expected to spend, or is that just because you are allowing a safe margin in expectation of it going up?

Mr. FORTIER: $2,100 is for acquiring a panel truck.

Mr. FULTON: I was referring to office stationery, supplies and equipment. You are increasing that item by $2,000, and you are increasing "Telephones and Telegrams" by $1,000 over what you asked for last year.

Mr. FORTIER: Of course, the increase there in office stationery is what is required, as a result of the Immigration branch being released of the statistical unit expenditures. Also, there is the question of equipment for the personnel division, the I.B.M. machines and the cards.

Hon Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is a non-recurring expenditure.

Mr. FORTIER: It is for the rental of the machine.

Mr. FULTON: Does the same kind of explanation account for the increase for telephones and telegrams?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To some degree that involves me personally. This is partly because there has been some increase in rates, but it is partly because of the fact that I happen to be, as well as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the minister for a province which is fairly remote. I do have occasion in the ordinary course of my duties to make quite a number of telephone calls to Newfoundland. Perhaps I had better not say the kind of thing that my colleague Mr. Carter said in the House of Commons, but it is not only rather

expensive but also rather exasperating. Nevertheless it still has to be done. Then, of course, I have some departmental responsibilities—I do not think they account too much for this figure, but a little—which my predecessor did not have, because I am the minister as well for the Archives and the National Library, which he was not. In "Telephones and Telegrams", I do not attempt to distinguished between my capacity as minister for that department and this. It is all charged to this department, and it would not be worth wasting time to do anything else.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we shall come to the question which you, Mr. Benidickson, wished to ask on immigration and which was deferred.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Mr. Chairman, on Friday we had some discussion about the necessity of people waiting for two years before they could be admitted—I am referring to the case of possible immigrants who have previously been residing in territories where we have not got adequate facilities for inquiring as to their former history. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, in the case of migrants of that type sponsored by close relatives, whether or not those relatives have been informed of the necessity for this delay or not.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think they are invariably informed, are they not?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That has been my understanding.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I have seen a number of replies to relatives of proposed migrants which have been very vague in their nature. It may be necessary because as you indicated some of the reasons for ministerial decisions might expose one to charges of libel and so on, but I was wondering if the hon. minister was giving these people some hope that at the end of two years they could expect to enter Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand it is always intended to do that, and if it has not been done in a particular case it is an omission or an error.

Mr. BENICKSON: The hon. minister has described two broad types of immigration, one sponsored by relatives or by employers and the other where the migrant alone initiates an application to come to Canada. With regard to this latter group of people, who might be called refugees, does the hon. minister think it might be possible, in the case of proposed migrants sponsord by near relatives in Canada, to be a little more lenient in so far as the time limit is concerned.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will talk to my colleagues about the matter, particularly to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the hon. Minister of Justice, and ask them to give consideration to this point which is not primarily the concern of the Immigration department, as members of the committee know.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the United States also have the two-year waiting period.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Let me interrupt you for a moment Mr. Chairman. I am not criticizing because it was very complicated, but I did notice in one of the Ottawa newspapers that they said on this very point the exact opposite of what I told the committee the other day, though I am sure it was done quite inadvertently. If a person is a bona fide refugee, and this is established to our satisfaction, the two-year waiting period does not apply. It applies only where the question of whether a man is a refugee or not is in some doubt.

The CHAIRMAN: I was saying that in the United States they have a two-year rule under which people must account for two years of residence before they can get a visa to go to the United States. Is our two-year rule based on the same version as that United States two-year rule?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is based upon the decision which was made by the government and for which the government took responsibility. For security reasons it was necessary to have the opportunity to look at the conduct of these people in some place where it could be looked at for two years.

Mr. DUPUIS: Is there any reason why that rule should not apply to all immigrants. That they should not stay two years in a country?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The hon. member and I cannot agree on this and we shall have to differ. I think that if we cannot give to the immigrants in general the same kind of freedom which we give to the rest of the people of Canada we are not advertising Canada very well. My position on this subject is completely liberal.

Mr. DUPUIS: I do not wish to argue with the minister on this point at all. I have been talking to immigrants and everyone tells me it takes 15 or 18 months before immigrants become used to our ways. So I think a two-year period should be recommended.

Mr. NESBITT: But does this two-year period apply to every country, or is the United Kingdom for example exempted?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It applies to people who come to us from countries where we have not facilities for "processing" them in the country of origin. The most frequent example I can think of is Yugoslavia. Prospective immigrants coming from Yugoslavia would be required to stay in some other country, in the normal course, for two years.

Mr. NESBITT: What happens in the case of people from west Germany for example?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In the case of west Germany we already have adequate facilities, and ordinarily a resident of western Germany has been there for, say, 20 years or his life span, however long that may be. In a sense this rule applies to everybody, but of course it has no consequence in the west where we have facilities for investigation.

Mr. NESBITT: The two-year rule would apply in the case of Yugoslavs and people from other countries behind the iron curtain?

Mr. JUTRAS: I take it it applies to a lot of countries in South America as well.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, it is reversed. People from those countries in Europe, to which I have referred, who are in South America must stay there for two years. If a native of South America is coming here, it does not apply.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Ukrainians have probably been the most trampled on of any of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and it must be very difficult for these Ukrainians who escape through the iron curtain to find employment and sustain themselves in another country for two years, particularly if they have managed to bring a wife, and perhaps a child along, too. This two-year rule, it seems to me, completely excludes this important group of migrants from a region from which a very substantial and fine part of our population of western Canada came. It seems to me that this two-year rule should be reviewed with that in mind.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It will be reviewed with that in mind, but one ought to realize on the other hand that there are many people who now inhabit that part of the Ukraine which is in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN: All of it is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. I think part of it is still in Czechoslovakia. But it is all behind the iron curtain. The government does not want to discourage these people at all. We recognize that amongst the best Canadians in this country are the Canadians of Ukrainian origin, but we have got to remember

on the other hand that for a country like the Soviet Union which wants, presumably, to have a certain number of people here who owe their allegiance to that country, nothing would be easier, if our rules were too slack, than to have a synthetic refugee with his family turn up in Austria or in west Germany or somewhere else with a harrowing tale of escape. As a matter of fact, the people who have experience in these matters say that this is done. These people, of course, would not when they got into west Germany start associating with communists there; they would do the exact reverse.

The CHAIRMAN: That is where I think that the two year rule does not serve much of a purpose. If the Soviet Union wanted to feed people in they would see to it that they obtained jobs; whereas, with the genuine refugee it would be almost impossible for him to do so in West Germany as it is today. I think that the two year rule does not serve the purpose at all.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It may be that it does not and, as I say, I will be glad to review it with my colleagues. It is not a rule insisted on by the Department of Immigration at all. It is a rule that has been laid down by the government on advice of its advisors on security.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does it mean that there has to be two years elapse before they can take the preliminary steps?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. They can make application. At the end of two years much has been done. It does not take too long after that. We are very conscious of the fact that it is a real hardship to people and we do try very hard to act quickly in those cases when the two years is over.

Mr. FULTON: Somebody said that the west German government is doing and has done a good job in trying to take care of these refugees. Is there any way we could assist if a refugee comes and says he wants to come to Canada. Of course, west Germany is granted her sovereignty now.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not yet. We have approved it.

Mr. FULTON: Is the west German government doing anything in the way of refugee camps? I understand that the I.R.O. ended its operations in 1952. They were an international agency which operated refugee camps and took care of the situation which we are now discussing. I understand that it was indicated by the west German government that they felt there was no necessity for that international agency continuing operations and it was abandoned I believe in 1952. What facilities are there in west Germany that exist for the purpose of taking care of refugees who are necessarily in there for the purpose of migrating—not to west Germany—but who desire to migrate from their country of origin to Canada and have to come through west Germany. What facilities are there now to take care of them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would ask the director of Immigration to answer that question.

Mr. SMITH: The west German government provide camps throughout Germany. Many of those are where the former I.R.O. camps which the German authorities formerly maintained as military establishments. They are still in existence. A refugee or an east German escapee comes over into Germany through Berlin and is screened there by the allied authorities plus the Germans to see what information they can obtain from them. Then, they are immediately sent to these camps dispersed throughout west Germany and are taken care of. Then, the west German government authorities through the various immigration missions endeavour to obtain end visas for those refugees who have been selected by the various countries' migration schemes.

Mr. FULTON: How long will the west German government permit them to stay in these camps supposing they say that they wish to go to Canada and have to wait two years? What facilities are there to care for them in that period?

Mr. SMITH: There is no time set, to my knowledge, by the German authorities that they will have to vacate. They were screened when they came in through Berlin and they have been able to get some information on many of them. It is then determined whether or not they are politically reliable, and those are classified as refugees and there is no two year period on refugees so far as we are concerned.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The two year period does not apply to bona fide refugees; only to people about whom we have doubt.

Mr. DECORE: When you are talking about screening, what facilities have you for screening?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Smith was talking about the German authorities doing the screening.

Mr. DECORE: You do a screening. How is it being done?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe Mr. Fulton has a question relating to this.

Mr. FULTON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will answer your question later, Mr. Decore.

Mr. FULTON: I understood that the reason for the two year waiting period imposed by Canada was that the people had come from behind the iron curtain where we have no facilities to process them and they are made to wait in west Germany or Austria as the case may be, in order that during that period we might keep them under some sort of observation and attempt to make up for the lack of facilities in the country behind the iron curtain. But, now do I understand there are cases where we are immediately satisfied they are bona fide refugees?

Mr. SMITH: Those who have not been able to satisfy the authorities I mentioned in Berlin are not classified as refugees for our purpose. The ones that are not must remain for two years because we have no facilities, no information, nor are we able to get it their having come from behind the iron curtain. Apparently as the minister just stated we do not know the nature of the screening by these authorities that I mentioned but there is some information available to these authorities that satisfy them as to their political allegiance.

Mr. FULTON: You have, in fact, two classifications for persons coming from behind the iron curtain: those who may be screened and passed for immediate passage to Canada, and those to whom you say: "You must wait for two years", because you cannot get any information on them. What is the situation in Austria? Is it the same as with respect to Germany?

Mr. SMITH: It is the same as it is in Germany.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): We are relying not on our own screening processes at all but on that of west Germany.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. It is the screening process carried out by the allied powers in control plus the west German government.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): That only applies to those who go through Berlin?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that as long as the occupation has lasted it has been applied to East Germans as well as to those who come from other places; but it is really mainly Germans who come from behind the iron curtain nowadays.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Smith says the examinations are conducted by the west German government. But that was not the case last year. They were operated by the provincial government. They were the ones who

were in charge of the examinations which I visited and they had full responsibility for them; it was a provincial responsibility and not one for the federal government at all.

Mr. SMITH: You are correct and when I said west Germany, the west German government, I intended to say that it was the provincial branch.

Mr. FULTON: The screening process in west Germany and in Austria, as I understand it, is carried on by the occupation authorities in co-operation with the west German government.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Or the Austrian government; that is the screening which determines whether a person is a refugee or is not a refugee, and that we do not do. But even in the case of someone who is a refugee, we have to make sure to see that our regulations are also applied; and our own screenings, of course, applies to all immigrants to Canada. I am sure that in the case of those who are classified as bona fide refugees, we do not take all the detailed precautions we would take in the case of those about whom there was greater doubt. Everybody knows the screening we give to a British subject from the United Kingdom is not so exacting as the screening we give to most people from the continent or from countries on the continent of Europe in which a number of people have been adherents of the communist party and so on.

Mr. FULTON: In the case of a person crossing the German border elsewhere than into Berlin—let us say the border between Germany and east Germany, and the border between Austria and the Russian occupied portion of Germany elsewhere than into Vienna—would he have to be sent to Berlin or to Vienna for his screening?

Mr. SMITH: Whether or not he is sent he would be screened in the same manner, and the information would be sent to a central place where they may or may not have information in regard to this individual, and before he would be accepted into one of those examinations.

Mr. FULTON: Who actually carries on this initial screening? Is it done by the allied occupation powers plus the west German government?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would not want to take the responsibility for saying anything about it at all.

Mr. FULTON: Under whose control is that screening done?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite honestly, I could not precisely say.

Mr. FULTON: Why is that too delicate?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is not too delicate. However, ministers are sometimes just plain ignorant.

Mr. FULTON: I heard Mr. Smith whispering. Why not let me ask him the question?

Mr. SMITH: I have not any knowledge of it because it is really not done by our officials.

Mr. FULTON: Surely, if I understand it correctly, the passage of a refugee towards Canada will be greatly expedited if the initial screening and a report on him is available.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If he is classified as a refugee, that classification of refugee is not made by the Canadian government. But I will assume that my predecessor satisfied himself that it was done in a fashion that would be reasonable for the Canadian government to accept. But that decision was made before I became minister, and up until this morning I have never had occasion to ask myself: "Now, precisely who are the people who do this, and in what precise manner is it done? And where does the prime control come from?" I do not know the answer.

Mr. FULTON: I am not asking the minister for detailed information. Quite obviously you would not be expected to describe the processing which the intelligence branches of these governments go through. But what we want to know and what I think we should know is this: under whose control, and with the co-operation of what authorities is this screening done?

The CHAIRMAN: That is, the minister can find out whether it is done by External Affairs or National Defence.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It has nothing to do with the government of Canada whatever, Mr. Fulton; and I repeat that we would undoubtedly have satisfied ourselves, before I became minister, that this was being done in a manner to which we could give our confidence.

Mr. FULTON: Or by people to whom we could give our confidence?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Or by people to whom we could give our confidence and I would be very glad to try to find out; but the plain fact is that I do not know.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Would not any applicant who has been screened by whoever does the screening and who then presents himself to our immigration authorities in West Germany—would he not present some document? Surely. And who would sign that document?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean a document certifying that he is a refugee?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. Smith might be able to answer your question but I do not know.

Mr. SMITH: The documents which we get and examine is one issued by the intelligence authorities who are advisors in security matters.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is this a certificate that he is a refugee?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Who would they advise?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know.

Mr. FULTON: Well, you will look that up and bring us the answer?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I will bring you the best answer I can.

The CHAIRMAN: That is something that the minister can answer later. He says that exactly what the situation is he does not know at the moment; and it may be that when he gets the information he can properly give it to the committee or it may be that he cannot.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It should be quite easy to answer Mr. Fulton's question as to exactly under whose jurisdiction this is done but at the present I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Nesbitt.

Mr. NESBITT: Along the same line, with respect to the procedure in the case of a proposed immigrant to Canada who has resided in Canada but as a non-immigrant; suppose he files an application and then is told that he must go back to his own country and make an application from there; could he not submit his application while in Canada on a temporary basis?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand that it all depends on the circumstances; sometimes they are processed while he is still in Canada and sometimes they are told that they should go back and make an application.

Mr. NESBITT: Could the minister give us any indication or idea as to people who are resident in Canada on a non-immigrant basis, and when they are told they have to go back to their original country to make their application?

Mr. SMITH: That is not done as a rule with the ones who are here, when we are satisfied that their intention when they came was not to circumvent any of our requirements. But we also advise them that their examination will take much longer in Canada than it would if they returned, or if they returned to their country of origin because of the procedures which have to be gone through, and that they can be dealt with much more rapidly on their return than would be the case if they remained here. However we do not insist on them going back if we are satisfied that the man is to be dealt with favourably here, and if he can comply with our requirements and regulations.

Mr. NESBITT: So it depends on the individual case?

Mr. SMITH: That is right.

Mr. NESBITT: Suppose a person comes from the United States. In all cases probably he would be able to be accepted rather than to have to go back to the United States and apply?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Whereas a person who comes from Italy or France might even have to go back to Italy or France to get through more quickly?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I might say a word about my own experience as minister in this matter. It is not very conclusive, but I think that there is a disposition on the part of the departmental officers, when someone has come in here as a non-immigrant with what looks pretty clearly like the deliberate intention of beating the regulations, to say, "Well, you can't do this; you have to go back and take your chances like the other people in the country you came from". But when someone comes genuinely as a visitor, likes this country and wants to stay, and looks like a person who in all probability might satisfy the regulations if he were processed, our disposition is not to suggest their return, I say that this is just the impression that I have obtained as minister from having dealt with cases of that kind. That is the kind of case that comes to me most often.

Mr. NESBITT: Thank you.

Mr. YUILL: I had occasion to check up on one case concerning immigration. The reply which the relatives received was that their brother did not measure up to the standards of the Immigration regulations. In the inter-family correspondence it was hinted that this person was asked to donate a certain amount of money, and because he refused the report was accordingly not favourable. Is that a fairy tale or could that possibly happen?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is not a question that any official should be asked to answer.

The CHAIRMAN: What did you mean by the question?

Mr. YUILL: Is there any possibility of that having any influence on what otherwise would be a valid application?

The CHAIRMAN: Where was he to donate the money—overseas or here?

Mr. YUILL: Overseas, to the man that made the check on his record.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What you are implying is, if I may use a blunter and plainer expression, that some Immigration officer overseas wanted a bribe and did not get it?

Mr. YUILL: That is what I would gather from the correspondence and the story told by the relatives. I am just wondering whether such a thing could possibly exist.

HON. MR. PICKERSGILL: The Immigration officers are, of course, human beings just like the rest of us, and I think it is in the knowledge of every member of this committee that there are some human beings who sometimes

do not do what is right and who do what is wrong. I would not say that that might not have happened in an isolated case. I hope it never happens, and I woud certainly be delighted to have any kind of evidence, if there is any evidence. I would not be delighted at all to find people like that, but if they exist I would certainly like to find them and I would like any help I could get to find them.

Mr. YUILL: I take it that the department would at least review that case, if such a thing were brought to light?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I certainly would. I give you that assurance without any hesitation whatsoever.

Mr. DECORE: Maybe this is not a fair question to ask the minister, but has the minister made any efforts to find out if there are any abuses in the practice of screening, that is, among the people whose job it is to do such screening, say, in West Germany or Austria?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I should perhaps come to Mr. Decore's earlier question first. I presume that what is usually meant by screening is this: the process of trying to determine whether a person who has applied to come to this country is likely to be a danger to the security of the state. Well, of course, that is really only a small part of the screening that we do. We also have to try to satisfy ourselves that an immigrant is not in any of the prohibited classes under the Act. The mere fact that they answer all these questions does not mean that we just take their word for it. We do make inquires to see whether they have any records with the police in the countries they are in, for example, whether they have done time for burglary, or even whether they have been fined for traffic offences. I may say that I do not think anyone has been kept out of this country because he has been fined for a traffic offence, unless it was a serious one of a genuinely criminal character. We also try to make sure that the person has never been an inmate of a mental hospital or other similar institution, because I am prohibited by parliament from admitting those persons knowingly to Canada. So a large part of this screening really has not much to do with the security of the state. It often comes to the notice of our own Immigration officers that people who have applied are members of the local communist party in the country in which they live. It might also come to their notice that they belong to some communist front organization, or in Germany that they belonged to the SS. or one or two other of these organizations that we did not view with much favour, or in Italy to the Fascist organizations that they had at one time or in the countries that were occupied by Germany to some of these organizations that collaborated with the Germans in an active way. That information might come to our officers in the ordinary way, but in addition to that, of course, we have the cooperation of certain agencies of our own government and certain cooperation from other governments whose officers are much more experienced in the matter of political security screening than Immigration officers could possibly be.

Mr. NESBITT: This is where you find out whether they are communists or not?

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): Are your own doctors responsible for the health examination?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Could I finish my rather long sentence first? As I was saying, the information that we get from outside our own department is supplied to us on the express undertaking that we will keep it confidential. I am assured that we would very quickly cease to get information on which we could place any reliance if we did not live up to that undertaking. That is the factual situation that I have to deal with as minister. In other words, I do not administer these agencies that provide us with that information. I have no control whatsoever over that. It is true that I am not bound to accept

such advice as I get, and I admit that sometimes I do not. I look at the advice, and sometimes I feel that these people, whose primary responsibility is to take no chances, sometimes go a little further in being careful than seems to me to be really necessary, and I sometimes do in fact waive security. I am responsible to parliament for what I do and if I make a mistake in any one of those cases, I shall have to answer for it.

Mr. DECORE: Will the hon. minister say whether a proposed immigrant who is turned down is given any reasons for his rejection? Suppose he comes from Germany or Austria. Is he given any reasons why he is not held to comply?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. DECORE: In other words, the decision may be based on the wrong information, but the man concerned has no right to have a say in the matter.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He is given no information for precisely the reason I have already given, namely because most of the information of this character which we obtain is not our information to dispose of as we wish. It is given to us for our use on the understanding that we can pass it on to nobody, and if we were to divulge it we should cease to get it, and if we are going to have this security screening at all we have got to have it on the only terms we can.

Mr. DUPUIS: Would the interested party be told the reason why he cannot come in?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. He would not. I think most of the apprehension about this subject arises—and I think these misgivings do us credit—about one simple point. It seems to have entered into the minds of many of the decent people of this country that in some way or other we are conducting a trial of an applicant for admission. We are not doing anything of the kind. The person concerned is trying to be given a chance to become a citizen of Canada and parliament has enacted that somebody has got to decide whether he is the kind of person we want. It is much more like an applicant for a job. If an employer who employs thousands of people had to explain to every unsuccessful applicant for a job why he was refused a post, if such a disappointed applicant had to be taken before some tribunal and the matter argued out, it would be perfectly impossible to get anything done at all; and if we had to devote the time of our immigration officials to this sort of task we would have no people left to process the great stream of immigrants which it is the purpose of the Immigration Act to encourage. It would be physically impossible, quite apart from all the money which would be required.

Mr. FULTON: There is, however, a contrary view to be expressed. If the hon. minister would establish some form of judicial or semi-judicial process to deal with these cases, his Immigration officials would be relieved of what is a most time-consuming job. The hon. minister's predecessor has stated, and the hon. minister has himself intimated, that it is these difficult cases which take up a great deal of the time of himself and his senior officials. In the absence of judicial or semi-judicial processes, these cases do not seem to be dealt with on such a basis that the decision in one case may be expected to be the decision in another. No reasons are given for the decisions taken privately and in closed circles within the department. One immigrant is allowed in but another, in what appears to be the same circumstances, is rejected and no satisfactory explanation is ever given as to what difference exists between the two cases. The suggestion is made by many responsible people that we ought to have suggested to set up some semi-judicial process—and I shall be referring to this in more detail at a subsequent sitting Mr. Chairman—inasmuch as it would relieve the department of a great deal of its present burden and also establish some form of consistency and precedent in dealing with these cases.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I want to deal with the single point raised in Mr. Fulton's argument now. I take it he is referring to applications for permission to enter Canada and not to proceedings with regard to deportation.

Mr. FULTON: To both.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: All right. But you are now referring here to applications for admission. The arguments are not the same in the two cases, in my view. In the case of applications for permission to enter Canada, for anybody except the responsible minister to make the decision would be against the law as it now stands. I think therefore it is quite outside the sphere of this committee to discuss the matter. It is a proper matter for Mr. Fulton, or any other hon. member of the House who wishes to do so, to introduce an amendment to the Act if he thinks it advisable, providing that the final decision as to the admission of immigrants shall be taken away from the responsible minister and given to a tribunal. If parliament wants to pass such an Act, I shall not have much to do. But at present, within the four corners of the law as it now stands, the position is the one I have outlined.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. minister is taking one possible application of what has been suggested and stretching it to its utmost limits. It is not necessary to stretch the point in that way in order to have an intelligent discussion of this question because part of what has been asked for is simply that the hearings should be public—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are no hearings in these cases at all.

Mr. FULTON: —and the decisions arrived at by a semi-judicial process.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Does that mean that when an applicant in Germany applies we are going to have a court over there?

Mr. FULTON: The minister knows that is not suggested at all. However, it is nearly 12.30 and there is no time to discuss the whole matter now in detail.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister has pointed out that there are two different problems, the question of deportation, and the case of persons trying to get into Canada, and he has said that he would deal with the latter at this time, and that is what his statement referred to.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is all it had reference to.

Mr. FULTON: Or having been vouched for by a Canadian citizen.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): In deciding the suitability of an applicant for admission, any criminal record is naturally taken into account. Is there some hard and fast rule? Obviously you would not let in a convicted bank robber or embezzler; but would you necessarily keep out somebody who technically had a criminal record, for instance a man who had a record as a juvenile?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The minister is not allowed to let anyone in with any kind of criminal record, if he is aware of it, but the minister may from time to time submit to the Governor in Council recommendations that certain people who at one time had a criminal record who are believed to have been rehabilitated may come in. That is done from time to time. That was not true in the old Act, but when the Act was liberalized in 1953 that provision was made.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): You can now distinguish between crimes?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I cannot, but the Governor in Council can.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: If you do in any of those cases allow admission you have to report that to council?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. The number of people admitted on the Minister's permit is what is reported once a year.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we propose to meet tomorrow in this room at 10.30. Wednesday is a day when we cannot very well meet in the morning and it is planned to meet at 3.30 on Wednesday afternoon in this room.

Mr. FULTON: I have a motion in the house on Wednesday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be perfectly happy to be available to the committee on Wednesday evening.

Mr. MONTEITH: No, no.

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet at 10.30 tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would also be prepared to come at 9 o'clock on Wednesday morning.

Mr. FULTON: So would I.

The CHAIRMAN: Could not some of the matters you are interested in, Mr. Fulton, be dealt with by somebody else on Wednesday afternoon?

Mr. FULTON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We will try to meet on Wednesday afternoon and tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is common for us to have a cabinet meeting on Thursday mornings and while as I said at the beginning of the proceedings I would be quite prepared to miss a cabinet meeting, I wonder if it would be possible to meet at 10 o'clock on Thursday and close at 12 o'clock so that I may go to cabinet for the last hour.

The CHAIRMAN: We will speak about that tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 4

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

WITNESSES

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

54236—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq., and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Power (*St. John's West*)
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, March 1, 1955.
(5)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Power (*St. John's West*), Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. Fulton raised the question of calling witnesses and filed with the Committee certificates, under the provisions of Standing Order 67 (1), requesting that John H. McDonald, Esq., Ottawa, and John R. Taylor, Esq., of Vancouver, be called.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Michener,—

That Mr. John H. McDonald, Barrister, of Ottawa, Mr. John R. Taylor, Barrister, of Vancouver, and Mr. John H. Dickey, M.P. of Halifax, be called to give evidence before the Committee as to the results of their investigation into the administration of the Immigration Act and as to any other matters arising therefrom on which the Committee may deem it proper to question them; and that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard.

A point of order having been raised that the question of calling witnesses had been decided at a previous meeting, the Chairman announced that, in order to study the proposed motion, he would defer his ruling until the next meeting.

Mr. Pickersgill raised a question of privilege and made a statement thereon.

The Minister supplied information requested at previous meetings.

The status of the Minister while appearing before the Committee was discussed, but the matter was allowed to stand until the next meeting.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. Wednesday, March 2.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

54236—1½

EVIDENCE

March 1, 1955
10:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: If the committee will come to order we will proceed.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion to make and a motion to lay before this committee this morning. Now that we have started on the consideration of the estimates and come to the item of the Immigration branch, I want to suggest to the committee, and later I shall formally move, that the committee seek the power to call witnesses and that it call as witnesses the two members of the Canadian Bar Association subcommittee whose names have been mentioned in the House, namely Mr. John H. McDonald and Mr. John R. Taylor. I do this for the following reasons: We are now considering the estimates of the department and the particular branch of the department against which the most serious allegations have been made and concerning which a number of recommendations for far-reaching changes in administrative procedure have been made. We are asked now to approve the estimates of money required for the operation of this branch for another year, and I submit that it would be most helpful to the committee and only logical in our consideration of the matter that we should have before us these gentlemen who make these charges and these recommendations, so that we can hear in detail what they are and what they would accomplish. This would assist us in arriving at our conclusions as to whether the administration of the department should be overhauled or amended so that more value for the money could be obtained and possibly money might even be saved. In suggesting that these two gentlemen be called as witnesses, I want to point out that they are members—

The CHAIRMAN: Before we spend too much time on this, I would point out that it is quite clear that we do not have the power in the committee at the present time to send for witnesses. We cannot send for them unless we go back to the House and obtain power to do so, and that has already been decided upon by the committee. I think it is a parliamentary rule that once a matter has been decided upon it is certainly unreasonable to ask that it be considered again.

Mr. FULTON: If you will permit me, I think I can save your time and the time of this committee by stating that I realize that the committee would have to obtain the power from the House. All that the committee decided was that it would not at the present time recommend to the House that it should have the power to call for persons, papers and things.

The CHAIRMAN: Before you argue the question that we should send for somebody—

Mr. FULTON: If you will permit me to complete my submission—

The CHAIRMAN: I am ruling you out of order in arguing that way in regard to calling for witnesses for this committee. I am saying that we have no right—

Mr. FULTON: I am moving that we seek power from the House to call witnesses. One of my reasons is so that we can call the witnesses I have mentioned. I told you at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I would be moving

that these witnesses be called and I am incorporating in my motion the recommendation to the House to empower the committee to call witnesses. I do not think that I could put it much more clearly.

The CHAIRMAN: We have decided already. The motion was made, and I suggested to your representative on the committee that he defer pressing the motion at that time and wait until we saw how we got along. He refused to withdraw it. He insisted that it be voted upon. I will read to you from the minutes of February 17. Here is what was moved by Mr. Fleming, seconded by Mr. Cameron (*Nanaimo*):

> "That this committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records".

After discussion, the motion was put and was negatived and at the request of Mr. Fleming there was a recorded division. Now, the committee has already decided against your motion to have the right to send for persons and papers. It definitely decided this, and that was only on February 17, a matter of two weeks ago. Nothing whatsoever has happened since then that would warrant our being asked to change our decision. If you can suggest that anything has happened or any evidence has been brought out that changes the situation and would warrant the committee's reconsidering its decision, it might be in order to bring it forward. But I would ask you to direct your argument, not to running over the same old ground upon which the committee has already decided, but to the question as to whether there is any reason to change that decision.

Mr. FULTON: That is what I was endeavouring to do when I was sidetracked. There is nothing in the rules or in common sense to prevent this committee from deciding that it shall ask for power to send for persons or things if, in the course of discussion, it becomes apparent that it would be advantageous to the committee's consideration so to do.

The CHAIRMAN: That decision has been already made.

Mr. FULTON: When that decision was made I was not a member but Mr. Monteith was, and I have also discussed it carefully with Mr. Fleming who was a member. The basis on which it was made was that we would not seek that power now but that it would be open to the committee at any time to do so if specific witnesses were required or something arose which made it desirable.

The CHAIRMAN: What has happened since then to indicate that there has been a change?

Mr. FULTON: Firstly, we have now embarked on consideration of the estimates of the Immigration branch. Yesterday the minister, in certain statements that he made, indicated that before a number of the recommendations which had been made by the subcommittee of the Bar Association and by members of the House itself could be implemented it would be necessary to change the Immigration Act. In my submission that is not in the slightest degree necessary. The recommendations made by the Canadian Bar Association subcommittee and accepted by their committee on civil liberties could be implemented simply by changes in the administrative procedure, I am informed, without in any way necessitating an amendment to the Immigration Act. I am suggesting that these gentlemen who made the reports, and had taken the matter under study for a period of two years—and whose report was accepted by the Council of the Bar Association but referred back to the Bar subcommittee for further study, and now forms the basis for that further study—these two gentlemen who have had great experience and have given the matter careful consideration, should be called before us to give us the benefit of their experience and of their findings in order that the committee may consider whether,

in the spending of the money for which the department is asking better value could be obtained or money saved as a result of these administrative reforms they recommended.

The CHAIRMAN: You are repeating exactly the same argument made by Mr. Fleming representing your party when he made the motion originally. We will not accomplish the task that was referred to this committee if we repeatedly go over the same ground and ask the committee over and over again to decide this question. I am asking you to refer to something that you may have that was not brought out by Mr. Fleming.

Mr. MONTEITH: This statement was not brought up before.

Mr. FULTON: You will recall that when you were chairman of the Veterans Affairs committee in 1946-47, the committee took a certain decision with regard to the Pensions Act. Nothing new was brought forward, but when one of the members reopened the matter you as chairman overruled any objections that this would be merely reversing a former decision. A vote was taken, the matter was reopened and the decision reversed. You were chairman of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe I recall the circumstances, Mr. Fulton, and something new had occurred, and I recall what it was.

Mr. FULTON: The only new thing that had occurred was that the minister had changed his mind and decided that his recommendation should be accepted. There was nothing new in the way of evidence. It is perfectly within the power—

The CHAIRMAN: What I am suggesting is—

Mr. FULTON: The question before this committee is whether we are going to obtain the benefit of witnesses who will help us or whether we are going to proceed in the dark.

The CHAIRMAN: What is new in this?

Mr. FULTON: We are now embarking on the consideration—

The CHAIRMAN: We have already considered that.

Mr. MONTEITH: But we had not started on Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. FULTON: At that time no department was before this committee. You were meeting to organize. We now have the Department of Citizenship and Immigration with its experts to give evidence. We have now passed the administration item and we are on the item dealing with the immigration branch.

The CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of persuading the committee to make a different decision, it seems to me that you should bring forward some new facts; otherwise you might expect the committee to make the same decision. If nothing new has happened that you can bring forward as a basis for your argument—

Mr. FULTON: I am prepared to back my suggestion with rational argument if you will give me the opportunity. You said that nothing new has happened. I have pointed out to you that something new has happened. We have got into the estimates of this department.

The CHAIRMAN: You mentioned the Canadian Bar Association and certain matters connected with it. That is not new. It was brought up in the House of Commons.

Mr. MONTEITH: It was never before this committee before.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee decided that it was not going to send for papers or call witnesses that argument that we should be able to send for these very gentlemen was mentioned.

Mr. MONTEITH: Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, it was in the mind of Mr. Fleming that these people be called and be able to go into this matter. I have no objection, as far as that goes, to the committee voting on this, but I do think that the committee does not want to spend a great deal of time hearing the same arguments over and over again on the same question.

Mr. FULTON: I am informed that the arguments in support of the calling of Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald were not advanced before this committee. I am now seeking the opportunity and insisting upon the right to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: In the first place it was generally argued that we should have the specific power to call people like the witnesses whom you are seeking power to call.

Mr. BYRNE: That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: What is there new about this motion? We knew that those people were available and we knew that they had made reports, and we were excluded by our reference from calling witnesses generally. Did that not exclude calling particular people?

Mr. FULTON: No, because at that time the decision was based, as I recall it, on the statement—I am informed that it was made by Mr. Benidickson, although the proceedings were not reported—that this could wait until we were in a position to consider specific persons. We suggest that the time has now arrived, and I ask for the right to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask you to confine yourself to arguments that were not presented before, because after all the arguments you are presenting now were gone over very ably by Mr. Fleming. In asking that we have a decision from the committee as to whether we call these specific persons, you should not go over the grounds already covered capably by Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your desire not to hear good arguments repeated, and I shall endeavour not to repeat anything that Mr. Fleming may have said. I submit to the committee that there are a number of reasons why these witnesses should be called.

Mr. BYRNE: On a point of order: the question now before us is a question of order, whether we may now discuss a matter that has already been decided. Does one member entirely dominate a meeting by standing up, or does another member have the floor when he requests it on a point of order?

Mr. FULTON: I will sit down if you are raising a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee, but my understanding is that at the meeting at which we decided that we would not ask for the power to call witnesses it was said that if we found we were not able to do the work that the House asked us to do we might later on decide to ask for the power to call witnesses. I suggested that the motion to ask for power to do so be withdrawn until we reached that point. Mr. Fleming insisted on having a vote at that time.

Mr. BYRNE: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: I warned him that if a vote were taken under the rules he would be closing the door. I stated that, if the committee should decide later on that it wanted the power, it would be faced with the fact that a decision had been made. Mr. Fleming insisted on a vote being taken and that the vote be recorded. Personally I do not want to insist on the letter of the rules too much if the committee is willing—and I think it would be—and Mr. Fulton is prepared not to ask the committee to listen to the same arguments that Mr. Fleming has made and not to ask the committee to reconsider its position without suggesting any new reason why it should. I do not think that we should stand too much on the rigid letter of the rules, but I do suggest that Mr. Fulton make his arguments without going over all ground which has

been gone over both in the House and in this committee and decided in the House and decided in this committee. I am quite prepared to have it considered again by the committee, but I do suggest that we cannot waste our time at every third or fourth meeting in going over this one question. Mr. Fulton knows that there is a rule that once a question is decided it cannot be reopened except by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I would accommodate myself—

Mr. BYRNE: On a point of order. Prior to taking the vote on this question you made a suggestion that if it were found that we wanted to obtain information required by the committee we might decide on some other course of action. So far no one has suggested that we have not been able to obtain the information requested. I see no reason for changing our attitude until the minister has refused to give information asked of him. We have made one decision. I for one have not changed my mind, and I doubt very much if other members have changed their minds.

Mr. FULTON: I think that what Mr. Byrne has said is perhaps a very good argument for putting the proposition before the committee, which I shall do briefly. I think that the members of the committee, Mr. Byrne included, have open minds and could be convinced by reasonable arguments placed before them for reconsideration of the matter. I am going to accommodate myself to your suggestion that I be brief in my argument.

I had just begun to mention the careful and lengthy study which these gentlemen have given to the question. I will not rehearse that any further, but I will say this: an impression has got abroad that the cases upon which the allegations were based—

Mr. BYRNE: An editorial has gone abroad.

Mr. FULTON: —were cases taken up exclusively by Mr. Taylor and his firm. I am informed that this is not the case. There were a large number of cases from all over Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I am raising an objection on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down and let the minister explain his point of order.

Mr. MICHENER: Can a point of order be raised by the minister?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The minister cannot raise points of order.

Mr. FULTON: What I am trying to do here is to establish the basis of Mr. Taylor's qualifications as a witness. I simply content myself with saying that the recommendations of the Bar Association Sub-Committee made, were not made on the basis of particular cases in which Mr. Taylor alone was personally interested; they were made on the basis of cases coming from all over Canada and handled by large numbers of solicitors which cases Mr. Taylor has reviewed as a sub-committee member. He would come here as a well qualified, well informed witness, if he were invited to give evidence.

With regard to the other witness whom I have suggested, Mr. McDonald, I realize that I am treading on delicate ground with my Liberal friends and I will try to put the matter as carefully as I can. Mr. McDonald is a lawyer of very wide experience in international law as well as in governmental and departmental work. In a press conference at Winnipeg and at another interview since with the press, Mr. McDonald has stated in a forthright manner—I will not go into details—that on the basis of his experience and his position as a lawyer he stands foursquare behind the statements made in these reports and the recommendations made by his sub-committee at Winnipeg. If he has been injudicious

he has had ample opportunity to reconsider. He now says, "As a lawyer, as a professional man and as one interested in the administration of a department which is of concern to the whole of Canada, I stand foursquare behind what my subcommittee recommended at Winnipeg and behind the appendices which have been referred to and upon which this report was based."

So that if we invite these two gentlemen to come before us, I think it is quite clear that we are not inviting somebody who is disgruntled or who has made a series of reckless statements. We are inviting two men who have given this matter more careful, and longer, consideration than anyone else in Canada and have, incidentally, been reappointed, just within the last week, by the Canadian Bar Association to continue as members of that subcommittee and to continue the study of the problems. The document prepared by Mr. Taylor will form the basis of that continuing study. I suggest to you and to members of the committee that when the Canadian Bar Association, in spite of all that has happened, is prepared to reappoint these two gentlemen and say, "We are so satisfied with your work that we want it to be the basis of a continuing study", this committee should think carefully before we turn down an opportunity to call them as witnesses. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Michener:

> That Mr. John H. McDonald, barrister, of Ottawa, and Mr. John R. Taylor, barrister, of Vancouver, be called to give evidence before the committee as to the results of their investigation into the administration of the Immigration Act and as to any other matters arising therefrom on which the committee may deem it proper to question them; and that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard.

I have here, and I shall file with the clerk, the necessary certificate signed by a member, stating that in my opinion their evidence is necessary and material.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apparently I have not the right to speak. Therefore I ask if I may have the permission to make certain observations immediately about this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is, of course, a renewal in this committee of a vote of want of confidence, based on the same documents, that was made in the House and turned down by the House at a very recent date. It seems to me that the committee might wish to hear why I feel that this would be a highly improper thing to do. In the first place a motion of want of confidence, based upon this very same material, was made in the House and turned down by the whole House. Now, the more serious feature is that I have never seen the charges that are made against this department.

Mr. FULTON: I beg your pardon.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The more serious part of this is that Mr. Fulton is basing his motion on documents which I have never yet seen.

Mr. FULTON: I insist upon the right to reply to that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was not allowed to interrupt the honourable gentleman and I hope that I may be allowed to proceed in a consecutive way without interruption.

Mr. FULTON: That would be a right which I did not have.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton, you were allowed to proceed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I realize that I am not a member of the committee. I am only the prisoner in the box.

The CHAIRMAN: I want Mr. Fulton to withdraw his statement that he was not permitted to present his case without interruption. He was permitted to proceed probably even against the rules of procedure.

Mr. FULTON: I was allowed to proceed, but was interrupted on at least two or three occasions.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The document which I placed on *Hansard,* as all members of the committee know, is the only document I received and that document was sent to me by the Canadian Bar Association; it is a document which was handed to me by my deputy minister who happened to be at the meeting and who told me that this was the document which Mr. McDonald had made public at that meeting. To the best of my knowledge and belief that is the only document that ever has been made public at the meeting in Winnipeg. When I asked in the House to have all these other alleged documents from which Mr. Diefenbaker read tabled in the House he declined to do so and refrained from answering my question as to whether they had ever been published and he has never made the slightest effort to let me see them.

Now, I say further that I am the minister responsible for this department. It was alleged by Mr. Diefenbaker in the House, it has been alleged this morning by Mr. Fulton, and the proceedings will show it, that there was a report accepted by the Canadian Bar Association. Now, that is not the information I have, and I have sufficient confidence in the way the Canadian Bar Association is operated to believe that if they had accepted any written report censoring or reflecting on my department, or making representations about it in any way, that some authorized member of the Canadian Bar Association would have made a communication of that to me. I have received no communication from the Canadian Bar Association or from any person authorized by the Canadian Bar Association. In other words, you are being asked in this committee to call two gentlemen who have so far produced nothing that the Canadian Bar Association has been willing to communicate to the government. All we have is what appeared in the newspapers which has given a certain amount of notoriety to unsupported statements. We are being asked on the basis of secret documents which I have never been allowed to see, to ask these gentlemen to come and support these secret accusations of which I am still unaware.

Now, if this is the way a parliamentary committee should be carried on it is something new in my experience.

Mr. FULTON: The minister has stated that he has never seen the documents. I, of course, accept that, but I state here that if so, it is one of the reasons why these witnesses should be called. My understanding is that the whole series of documents were presented to the deputy minister, two before the Canadian Bar Association meeting in Winnipeg and two immediately afterwards, and that the deputy minister has therefore had two since before the convention and the whole set since immediately after the convention; and if the minister has not seen them then I suggest it is another indication of a administrative breakdown in the department. Since accusations of irresponsibility and breach of secrecy have been made here I suggest they must be called here in all fairness so they can satisfy this committee, for instance as to whether or not they as members of the sub-committee ever did, as they say they did, seek on numerous occasions to have an interview with, not this minister but his predecessor, before this matter even came up before the Canadian Bar Association. I understand they did have an interview—of barely five minutes—and the contents of the documents were barely referred to and the minister afterwards was not able to see them.

These documents have been in the hands of the department for months. They were known to be documents on which the sub-committee were basing their report to the main committee. The fact that the Canadian Bar Association did not adopt that report is not material, because it did not come before them, the council of the Canadian Bar Association having referred it back to

the sub-committee for further investigation. The minister referred to them as secret documents, which he said, "I have never seen". He said that in the House of Commons. If the minister has not seen them it seems to be an example of a most complete administrative breakdown in the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Have these documents to your knowledge ever been published?

Mr. FULTON: It depends on what you mean by "published".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To the public.

Mr. FULTON: No.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Exactly.

Mr. FULTON: The minister says that he has never seen them—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know what they are.

Mr. FULTON: Yet the minister said on a previous occasion in the House that he would not mind if these documents were broadcast. Because he said:

> I have seen a document which I am informed was prepared by Mr. Taylor. I am reading from page 1242 of *Hansard*—and which I assume is the same one.

Then he goes on:

> At any rate, I have read a summary of these cases which are supposed to reveal the shocking practices in the department. I would not care at all if it were published anywhere at any time, because I am sure most hon. members on both sides of the House, if they read it, would have the same impression I had.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: May I reply to that?

Mr. FULTON: Now if the minister says in the House he does not mind if they are published and says he has seen the summary of the cases, why is he trying to base his case here, in resisting this motion, on the statement that these documents have never come to his attention?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have seen certain documents which I was told were prepared by some of these gentlemen long before the Canadian Bar Association ever met. I was shown those documents in confidence. I understood that the Canadian Bar Association had never authorized their publication and I respected the confidence I was given. Now, I do not know and I have no means whatever of knowing whether those documents are the same or similar to the documents that Mr. Diefenbaker quoted from in parliament. I cannot tell. They may be exactly the same but I do not know. I have never received from anybody authorized to give it to me any communication from or on behalf of the Canadian Bar Association which would enable me to identify these documents as documents I had ever seen. The document I put on *Hansard* was the only one I knew had been published and I was not going to put on *Hansard* documents that I had been shown in confidence and break that confidence. If other people wish to break confidences of that sort it is their business. It appears to me that, since this document has not been published except in bits and pieces which seems to suit certain gentlemen, they must be rather ashamed of the way in which they obtained it and of the fact that they have it in their possession. I still do not know what the document is.

Mr. FULTON: I wish to answer that right away. The minister is trying to draw a red herring, by referring to documents. I suggest we get the witnesses here who wrote the documents and could describe the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suggest that you put the document on the table now.

Mr. FULTON: I suggest that the deputy minister had those documents.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that there are three or four other members of the committee who would like to speak on this subject and I would further suggest that you sit down and give some of the other members of the committee an opportunity.

Mr. FULTON: If these witnesses are called, it can be and will be established that these documents were in the possession of the deputy minister and that there was correspondence at the deputy ministerial level with the members of the subcommittee which was not confidential. There were also letters submitted by the members of the subcommittee to the department. If they have not come to the attention of the minister that is a matter of departmental responsibility. Secondly, I am informed that the minister was made aware by letter of the contents of these documents shortly after the time of the Winnipeg convention and that it was suggested by him that these documents and the whole subject would be carefully considered by his deputy minister. I am stating that as a fact on the basis of my information. If my statements are not correct there is one very simple way to resolve all the doubt, and that is to call all the witnesses and get at the facts. I am not concerned about whether these documents were secret, but I am suggesting to the committee that we get these qualified and experienced witnesses before the committee. I would hope that we would discuss the merits of the allegations made and suggestions for administrative reform by these gentlemen.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to Mr. Fulton and I am not going to repeat his arguments, but it seems to me we are spending $31 million of the taxpayers' money in this department. I was very interested in this subcommittee of three which criticized the department so vigorously a while ago. I do not know whether there was much merit to their criticism but I rather think the committee should hear what they have to say. The only weakness to the amendment is we rather think it should include the late member of the Canadian Bar Association committee Mr. John H. Dickey, senior member from Halifax. We are very interested in knowing why he took such a bold stand and then scampered like a scared puppy when the subject became contentious.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that it is fair to speak that way about another member who is not a member of the committee.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to know why he changed his mind. Put it that way. I will move, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that after the words "Barrister of Vancouver," be added the words "Mr. John H. Dickey, senior member from Halifax."

Mr. FULTON: If that amendment is in order I would be personally prepared to accept it.

Mr. DECORE: I feel that both the amendment and the original motion are out of order and I think you should so rule. I think, Mr. Chairman, you have indicated that this matter was decided at a previous meeting of the committee and it was suggested to Mr. Fulton that unless there was something new he could show as to why this committee should change its views that the matter had been decided. If Mr. Fulton could show there was something new then I might be prepared to not follow the letter of the rules very closely, but he has not shown anything as to why this committee should change its mind. It is my submission that both the original motion and the amendment is out of order and it should be so ruled upon by the chairman.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: The purpose of this committee is to examine the estimates of the department. Now, I do not know of any lawyer whose ability is so great that he can be of any help to us in examining the estimates of the department. However, if these lawyers have any suggestions as far as amend-

ment of the Act is concerned they can inform our hon. friends who will have ample opportunity in the House to suggest amendment to the Act. We are on estimates now and I think we will lose time if we have any outsiders here to examine these estimates.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not think that any member of the committee wants to hide behind a point of order. It is open to the committee surely to determine whether a witness is worthy of being called and whether his evidence is likely to be in point or out of point. We are here to examine the question of supply for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration—a sum of $30 million is to be voted—and in the course of doing so it is appropriate for us to find out all we can about the way that department is administered and the money spent. It seems to me that when it is suggested that witnesses who are reputable people and who have made a special study and have special experience in the field of practice of the department are available that we should avail ourselves of the opportunity of hearing them.

I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the minister that his point seems to be that what we are asking is to hear an accusation by the Canadian Bar Association. I do not see it in that light. As I understand the motion we are asking the committee to hear the witnesses who are available and who are willing to testify and whose evidence would be of use in the job we have to do.

Mr. MCLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that we are here to make a thorough study not only of the administration but of the estimates. We are asked at the present time to have a couple of gentlemen here whose veracity I am satisfied of but, at the same time I wonder if it would not be better instead of having them here in person that we should have the report itself and if there is any further information we still require in connection with this report possibly we can deal with the other question at a later stage. I would like to suggest that we get this report tabled so that everyone of us may have an opportunity to examine it. I am not saying that we are competent or more competent than these hon. gentlemen solicitors, but I believe we are quite capable of making a thorough study of this report and I would like to see it tabled.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am heartily in accord with that suggestion. I would be delighted to see the document on which Mr. Fulton is basing his motion. I would be only too happy to have the whole document published.

Mr. FULTON: Ask the deputy minister for it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am asking the member who made the charges to make it public.

Mr. FULTON: The witnesses, if they are brought here, will bring it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There might be some merit in the argument of confining ourselves to having the document filed here were it not for some things that have been said this morning. I am rather confused by the conflicting statements made by the minister as to whether he has actually seen these documents; whether he considers he must not admit it in public or whether he really has not seen them. There is the question as to whether his department is being administered in such a way that the minister actually knows what is going on, and for that reason I think we should have these gentlemen before us to give evidence of their apparent attempts to meet the minister which have been apparently short circuited somewhere in the department.

Mr. MONTEITH: I feel that this motion is absolutely in order. My recollection of the organization meeting was that when Mr. Fulton originally made his motion that when it was voted down one of the reasons for voting it down

was that we could still at some future time when we got into the actual estimates call for such papers, persons and things if we saw fit. I think that this is one instance when we should do that.

Mr. DECORE: That is the second time that argument has been brought up this morning. I do not remember any suggestion that this thing could be re-opened any time that anyone happened to want to do anything. I do not remember there having been any suggestion made that any new grounds would be sufficient for reopening it. We tried to discourage Mr. Fleming from deciding it at that time before the committee had a chance to operate and he insisted that it be decided then and it was decided and I thought it was final.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that that is where the confusion has arisen. It was pointed out to Mr. Fleming that we had not been given this power by the House and that the House had set us up to operate in a certain way. I suggested that we should go along as the House had asked us to operate and see if we could carry out the intentions of the House satisfactorily and that he should not pursue his motion that we at once go back to the House and ask for powers they had not give us and that we should wait to see if we could function the way the House set us up to function. I asked him not to pursue his motion for the very reason before us this morning. If he pressed his motion before we knew just how the committee was going to carry on then later on if it seemed a good thing to call for persons we would have already closed the door and decided the question and I urged that we leave ourselves in the position where we would not be in that spot and asked Mr. Fleming to withdraw his motion for that very reason. He insisted on having the vote to decide whether or not we should have the power to send for papers, persons and things and this was done in spite of my urgings that he should not have a decision made and that he should wait to see later on whether he should ask for that power. He insisted on having a vote. Where does that put me?

An hon. MEMBER: Are we bound by that?

The CHAIRMAN: I had it very clearly in my own mind once a thing is decided that it cannot be reopened except by unanimous consent, and that is what I had in mind in urging this on Mr. Fleming. I have not had time to look into the thing very closely but I find para. 386 of Beauchesne's reads as follows:

> A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which, during the current session, has been decided.

Now in committee we are bound by the rules of the House. Obviously a motion like this would not be entertained for a moment by the Speaker; so I am in exactly the same position. We are in effect asking that a motion be entertained exactly similar in effect to what we voted down approximately two weeks ago. If I allow this motion I am absolutely flouting a definite rule of the House.

Mr. THATCHER: This is a procedural motion.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a motion to be decided upon within the rules. The first difficulty is that it is against the rules to actually bring a motion forward that has already been decided upon. The next difficulty is the way this motion is worded it looks to me as if an attempt has been made to get around this and in doing so the mover has made a motion that I could not accept anyway because in Beauchesne's at 676 it is laid down:

> The committee cannot order the summoning of witnesses or the production of documents unless it has the necessary authority, given to it by the House, 'to send for persons, papers and records'.

That is very clear that we have not the power to order the attendance of a witness. All that we have power to do, if we have not already decided the question, would be to ask the House, as Mr. Fleming moved, that this committee

recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and that would be a resolution that had it not been for the prior vote would have been in order, but it has already been moved and turned down and decided. In the way this is worded it is:

> "That Mr. John H. McDonald" and so on "Be called to give evidence before the committee as to the results of their investigation into the administration of the Immigration Act and as to any other matters arising therefrom on which the committee may deem it proper to question them . . ."

It is clearly out of order up to there. We do not go on to say that we ask the House that we be empowered to do this.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, we do.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. It says:

> And that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard.

A select committee does not recommend things to the House when it is asking for powers. We are not the boss of the House; the House is boss over us, and a resolution cannot be couched in a manner like that so far as I am concerned where I would be in the position of having to bring it as a recommendation of this committee. It would have to be worded in such a way that we would be asking first for power to do it. We would ask the House that we recommend that we be given the power to do. Then, having recommended that we be given the power in order to call these people that would have been the proper form if it had not transgressed the other rule. But we are starting out by saying that we actually call these people and then ask the House that we make a recommendation that the House grant us the necessary powers to do so. We have no power to pass a resolution calling a witness until we have that power from the House. It would be improper in my judgment.

I am in this position—I had this in mind right from the start when I asked Mr. Fleming not to press his motion to a vote—that I feel that the time might come when this committee might want very much to call a witness. But, there was no listening to reason or any argument that morning. It was pressed on to a vote. The door has been closed and locked and it is my duty to enforce the rules and I propose to do so, gentlemen, regardless of whether it be misunderstood here and in other places.

Mr. FULTON: May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, if you are about to make your ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, you have referred to the rule in Beauchesne regarding the bringing forward of a motion or amendment which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided. I think that the answer to that is found in the remark of Mr. Michener that this is a procedural motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you cite anything in Beauchesne making a distinction in that regard?

Mr. FULTON: The House frequently, for instance, in one session will adopt certain hours of sitting and later in the same session will adopt different hours or will revert to the former hours. Those are procedural motions and it would become an impossible situation if procedural motions could not be reopened. Secondly, I refer to the decision I have already mentioned in the Veterans Affairs committee in 1946 where a motion was reopened and later reversed while you were chairman. It is true that in respect to that you said that something new had arisen.

The CHAIRMAN: What decision was made that was reversed?

Mr. FULTON: It was in respect to the benefit of doubt clause in the Pensions Act. I do not have the details before me but I remember it clearly. Dealing with your argument, in which you said that was allowed because something new had arisen, I suggest that something new has arisen here with respect to the evidence now before us, since as I stated, it is a fact that these documents and the recommendations have been in the possession—

The CHAIRMAN: Was it not unanimously agreed that we should reopen that question?

Mr. FULTON: Far from it. There was a vote at all stages.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot recall any decision which was made that was later reversed.

Mr. FULTON: I am certain that the record will bear me out. I rest my case here on the assertion that some new facts have come to the attention of the committee and as a matter of fact the whole thing now is obviously in the realm of controversy as a result. On those two grounds, because it is a procedural motion and because new developments have occurred. I submit that the motion is in order.

Dealing with your next point, that the motion starts by stating that these two witnesses should be called and that we have no power, I submit that the point you have raised is answered by the last three lines of the motion which read:

> "And that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard."

Quite obviously this motion must be taken as a whole and the first portion read subject to the second, so that we are not doing anything except subject to the condition that the House grant us the necessary powers. The motion says that we recommend to the House forthwith that they do so. As to your objection that it has been made a recommendation, I point out that in the minutes before you there is a report by this committee of the same sort. It was the words, "We recommend that the quorum be reduced." So it is quite open to the committee to make a recommendation along these lines. This motion, being read as a whole, therefore, is, I submit, perfectly in order; but if it would help to resolve any difficulties which you may feel in the matter I would be perfectly prepared to reword the motion by commencing with the words: "Subject to the granting of the necessary powers by the House, that Mr. John H. McDonald..." and thus continue with the appropriate recommendations or request to be made to the House forthwith. I think that would take care of any difficulties with regard to the point of order. So, in regard to the point you have raised, I submit that this motion is quite in order. I think that you yourself realize that. You felt that it was a matter that would have to go to the committee for a decision. You ruled that it was in order and admitted discussion on it on that basis, and I am just reinforcing your original decision, which was quite obviously the correct one.

The CHAIRMAN: I permitted discussion on this matter so that you could show what evidence you had as a basis for asking the committee to take a position different from what it took two weeks ago. However, I have been taken by surprise by this motion today. I thought that the matter had been decided two weeks ago. I want to be very sure that I do not rule a motion like this out of order, preventing us at any time in the future during the present session except by unanimous consent from actually deciding to ask for power to call for witnesses. I do not like to see this committee in that position. That is the very thing that I wanted to avoid from the beginning—and want to avoid now, because if I make a decision now that it is out of

order this would mean, of course, that no matter how much we might wish to have the power we could not ask for it at this session without a unanimous vote. So, unless somebody wants to speak, further on the point, I am going to take the best advice I can obtain on the matter before I make a ruling, because I would hate to see the committee in that position. I do not propose to make any ruling that is not in accordance with the parliamentary rules under which we operate, because I am well aware of the fact that hard cases make bad law. If you make a bad ruling once it is cited to you for the next five or six years. So I am ready to take advice on the matter and on all the points raised by Mr. Fulton and the other members of the committee. It will not hold up the work of the committee if I defer a ruling until tomorrow morning, and I do not want to make a decision entirely on my own on this very important question. Now, if that is satisfactory, I will defer the ruling on this motion until tomorrow, so that I may have time to go into it further myself and take advice. Now we can go on with the other matters before the committee.

I understand that the minister would like to raise a question of personal privilege, and I think that this would be the time for him to do that, unless somebody wants to make an observation on what I propose to do.

Mr. STARR: I want to make one observation. I have listened with interest to the debate on whether this procedure is correct or not and whether it is in order to call these witnesses who have made allegations against the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the minister. I think that any attempt to forestall calling these gentlemen as witnesses before this committee would be most unfair to the department and to the minister himself. Because of the fact that they have made allegations against him, I think the opportunity should be given to him to see whether these allegations are correct. If they are left in their present light, a very bad reflection will be cast on the minister and his department, when we could give him the opportunity to clear these allegations by calling these men.

The CHAIRMAN: Much of the difficulty arises again out of something that has happened. Someone reads from a document in the House and it is not made available to the other members, and then the minister says, as he has a perfect right to do, "I do not know what is in that document, because it is only in the knowledge of the member reading it." Then the suggestion is made that it was a certain document, but nobody knows whether it was that document or not unless an opportunity is provided to see the document from which the hon. member for Prince Albert read and compare it with the document to which Mr. Fulton is referring. Nobody knows whether it is the same document or not.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. member for Prince Albert identified the document, gave the date and the heading.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He declined to give me a date.

Mr. FULTON: Furthermore, the document was submitted to the deputy minister for the purpose of bringing it to the attention of the minister and with the expectation that it would come to the attention of the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Members have said that this is a copy of a certain document, and the minister has said, "I do not know until I see it whether it is or not; and the hon. member for Prince Albert refuses to table it so that it could be checked up." There is no suggestion that the minister has said anything that is out of order or anything of the sort. It just arises out of the fact that the member for Prince Albert was reading from a certain document and refused to table it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the basis of my question of personal privilege. I did not want to interrupt the debate, as I recognize that I am not

a member of the committee, but Mr. Cameron raised a question as to my veracity. Perhaps he did not do it intentionally.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I said that I was unable to decide what it was you were telling us.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I speak slowly and without interruption, I will try to make it very clear what I was saying. I tabled a document, and it is printed on page 1241 of *Hansard*. This document was addressed to Mr. A. J. Cowan, chairman of the civil liberties committee, Canadian Bar Association. I put every word of the document I quoted on *Hansard* so that everybody would see from what I was quoting.

Mr. FULTON: On a point of order, and I will be very brief—

The CHAIRMAN: The minister is speaking on a question of privilege.

Mr. FULTON: My point of order is relative to the right of the minister to speak on the question of privilege. I am not seeking in any way to prevent the minister from speaking, but I am pointing out this: the minister is in the position of a witness—and I point this out with respect—and it is in that position that he is now raising a matter of privilege. I am not seeking to deter him from doing that, but he is raising a matter of privilege with regard to the handling of some documents. I suggest that if the minister is granted that right then the committee must be in the position where other witnesses can be called in order that they may refer to the same matter and as to whether or not to their knowledge the minister or the department has seen the documents and whether the documents are the same or not. If we hear the Minister, who is a witness, give an explanation relating to documents, I submit that we must be in a position to allow other witnesses the same opportunity to speak on questions of privilege or to speak directly to the subject matter of the documents and their handling.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Fulton, you have brought attention to a matter to which some attention perhaps shoud be given: I think that everybody felt that the proceedings before this committee should be the same as before the committee of supply. In the committee of supply the minister is sitting not only as a minister but as a member of the committee of supply, and I think that it was always the intention that the minister should not come before this committee other than as a responsible minister and member of the House of Commons and that when the committee was dealing with his estimates he would be an ex officio member of the committee. Otherwise he could not properly handle the work.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not in the terms of reference.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not in the terms of reference, but I think that it was taken for granted. I can see myself that if the minister is going to be on equal terms with the people with whom he is dealing he has to be a member of the committee or an ex officio member.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): He is not at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: At the moment he is not, and that is something that will have to be taken care of at once, because it is most unfair for a member of parliament and a minister to be in a position where he is not on equal terms with other members of the committee.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Last year in the Banking and Commerce committee we had the Minister of Finance before us. He was neither a member of the committee nor in any different position from any other witness before the committee. There was no suggestion at that time that he had to be made a member of that committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to you that this is very different because in our terms of reference it was decided that we had no right to call witnesses. The minister is not here as a witness because we have no right to call witnesses. It was understood that he appeared before the committee as a minister of the Crown and as an ex officio member of the committee. This is something that has been overlooked and I think it should be remedied without delay.

Mr. FULTON: On the point of order, the minister is not under the terms of reference a member or an ex officio member; he is a necessary witness. Therefore it is inherent in the powers under which we proceed in this committee that we have the power to call witnesses.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Incidentally, we have no power to add members to the committee.

Mr. FULTON: I hope that the minister will be given the opportunity, and I think he should be given the opportunity, to state his question of privilege, but I am saying that if the minister is permitted to give evidence—and that is what it amounts to—with respect to these documents, the committee must be in a position, if we accept that, where we have the right to call other witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: The idea is not that the ministers appear as witnesses, but they appear in the same way as ministers appear in the committee of supply, to explain the various matters put to them arising out of their estimates.

Mr. FULTON: The minister is automatically a member of the committee of supply; he is not a member of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I am satisfied that that is an oversight, because it was not intended that we have the power to call witnesses. It was stated that the minister could call on any of his officials to answer questions but he would have to take responsibility for their answers as the responsible minister. In other words, the answers to questions here are not given to the committee as from witnesses but as statements made on the authority of a minister of the Crown. So any suggestion made that when we hear the minister or anyone designated by him answering questions that they are here as witnesses is not in accordance with the basis on which this committee is set up.

Mr. FULTON: But it is in accordance with the rules, and in accordance with the terms of reference of the committee. It would be obviously absurd if we could not call the minister as a witness. As a matter of fact, we call other witnesses; we have here Mr. Smith and Colonel Fortier as witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: They are not witnesses.

Mr. FULTON: They are not members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: They are here to explain, under the direction of the minister, points that may arise.

Mr. FULTON: If the committee did not ask the minister to come, even the minister could not get here.

The CHAIRMAN: This is an attempt to be reasonable about this matter and to meet the suggestions of members. It was suggested in the first place that the person to explain the estimates at all times would be the minister responsible, as in the committee of supply. Then for the purposes of this committee, it was suggested that it would save time, if the minister were willing to have the various officers of the department speak directly to the committee instead of through him. Now every member of this committee knows that that is the intention and that there is no point in trying to change the whole basis upon which these people are before us, because we are set up by the House, and everybody knows how it was envisaged that we should operate. It has been stated that the minister is a member of the committee of supply, and that the minister appearing before us should first be made a member of this committee.

I think that that will be taken care of in the future. It is something that I believe may have been overlooked. Perhaps it was taken for granted that he was a member of the committee but, of course, he does not happen to be. These things do happen. But I have no duobt that it will be found possible to make him a member of this committee, and I think that everybody will agree that that should be done.

Had I been given notice of this motion by Mr. Fulton, I would have been prepared to make a ruling on it at once; but I did not get any notice of it, and I think that, in fairness to the committee in this important matter, I should reserve my ruling in order to make sure that it is right.

Mr. GARLAND: With all due respect, I disagree with that. I do not believe in delaying this matter any further, as it is only wasting the time of the committee. Surely you can see what is being done here. A whole series of arguments are being advanced, the same ones that were advanced at a recent committee meeting. Other arguments are being put forward with monotonous repetition, the same ones that were put forward in the House, taken from a document which the gentlemen referring to it are still refusing to place in the hands of the committee.

Mr. FULTON: I am asking that witnesses be called who will place them in the hands of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, Mr. Fulton. You have a right to table this document as a member of this committee. There is nothing to prevent you from tabling it right now.

Mr. FULTON: It is not my document. What document?

The CHAIRMAN: The document you are talking about.

Mr. FULTON: I am asking that witnesses be called—

Mr. GARLAND: In the setting up of this committee it was not in the terms of reference that the committee should call witnesses. That was enough for most of us. We wasted a whole meeting the other day in discussing this matter. We have another motion today that we be empowered to call witnesses, but this matter was decided at the other meeting. By permitting this discussion to go on, you are just wasting the entire time of another meeting and I suggest, with respect, Mr. Chairman, that if you do not make a decision today we will probably waste the whole two hours of another meeting arguing about the way in which we are going to proceed. We are defeating the purpose of the committee, which is to examine the estimates. It seems to me—and I take full responsibility for this—that this is an attempt to get away from doing the job that this committee was set up to do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GARLAND: I suggest that you follow the debate that took place in the House of Commons on this matter. For years now, ever since the time I entered the House, there has been a plea from the opposition for a committee of this kind. To me it was quite obvious—and this is my own impression—that when it was proposed in the House it was accepted with some reluctance in certain quarters of the opposition. It seems to me that now that they have it they do not know what to do with it. I suggest that you rule this motion out of order and that we get on with the business for which we were set up.

Mr. FULTON: On the point of order to which Mr. Garland was speaking, it is entirely acceptable to me whether you rule on the motion now or wait. Our position is clear. Our position is that we asked for a committee on estimates, but we asked for a committee that would gain information and not hide it. We want this committee to succeed. We think we can make a contribution by the examination of the estimates and by bringing forward some useful suggestions

as to ways in which the administrative practices of the department can be improved. In this regard, we now suggest that the committee take the benefit of qualified experts who have made a study of the whole question. Their suggestions have been brushed aside by the minister. I am asking that these witnesses be brought here.

The CHAIRMAN: You have done that already. Do not reargue the matter.

Mr. FULTON: I am dealing with Mr. Garland's statement that it will not be in the best interests of the work of the committee.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Why not give us the information and table your document?

The CHAIRMAN: I am clear in my mind that the motion is out of order, but I want to be sure about it. No time will be lost. If this is permitted to be left in my hands, I will make a decision tomorrow morning, and if it is appealed there will be a vote on it. There will be no debate. I believe that the motion is out of order, but I want to look into it to make sure and to take advice on the matter from the clerk and others whom I have a right to ask for advice. I think that the committee would want me to take that attitude, and I am prepared to do that. I will give my ruling tomorrow, and if the committee does not accept it there will be no debate; it will be just a matter of either sustaining my ruling or not sustaining it. Had I been given notice of this motion, I would have been prepared to rule on it this morning, but I was not.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I move that the ruling be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. DUPUIS: I second that.

Mr. FULTON: When you obtain advice on this matter—and I am quite agreeable that it should be obtained—would you point out to the clerk that, I am prepared to suggest that, if it will resolve the difficulty, the opening words shall read: "Subject to the necessary authority of the House".

The CHAIRMAN: I shall explain to him that you are ready to change the motion to meet the second objection that I made. Now may we go on to other matters? I appreciate very much the motion of Mr. Deschatelets and Mr. Dupuis, but I do not think it is necessary.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: May I make my statement in response to what Mr. Cameron said?

Mr. FULTON: On a point of order: if the minister is to make this statement the committee is placing itself in a position where it is hearing from a witness—and if we are to hear from one witness—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Let me at least say why I think I am entitled to make a statement and let the committee decide. It has been suggested by several members of this committee, and particularly by Mr. Cameron, that I in fact did seem to have in my possession the document about which we are carrying on this discussion and which I have said I have not had in my possession. In other words, my veracity has been questioned. Whether I am a member of the committee or not, I am a member of parliament and surely, when my veracity is questioned, I am entitled to state what the truth is and to state it at the time when my veracity is questioned and not some days later. That is what I ask.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask that the minister be permitted, without any question, to make a statement. Unless it is the unanimous wish of this committee, we will, however, defer his statement until tomorrow, when he will be in the committee as a member and be entitled to act with the same freedom as other members of the committee. Is it agreed that the minister be allowed to make a statement of his position on that question?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Since my name has been brought into this, Mr. Chairman, I shall have to reserve the right to speak on a point of privilege after, because the minister has already changed the statement that he has made. It had nothing to do with the possession of the document.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the minister be heard?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Unanimously.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The situation is this, sir. To the best of my knowledge I was shown every document which the deputy minister received in confidence at the bar association meeting, before it and after it. I did not at any time receive any document from the bar association or from any person authorized by the bar association or authorized in any way to communicate it to me. The deputy gave me this one document which I read into *Hansard* and he told me that this document had in fact been made public in Winnipeg, and of course it was reported in the newspapers. Since it had been made public at the bar association, I felt that I was betraying no trust of any kind by putting it on *Hansard*. I understood that this was the only document which had been made public or which the bar association had authorized to be made public because of a sentence that is contained in paragraph 4. To make myself coherent I have to read that particular part:

> In addition a great deal of valuable research work was undertaken by John R. Taylor, a member of the committee. Mr. Taylor has reviewed over two hundred specific cases and has written four comprehensive reports on administrative procedures. These reports have been invaluable to the subcommittee and will form the basis for further study and representations. Copies of these reports are being filed with the chairman of the committee on civil liberties. However, the committee and particularly Mr. Taylor, the author, believe that until such time as the new minister of citizenship and immigration has had an opportunity of reviewing the detailed material contained in these reports, they should not be generally distributed.

Now, those reports were never communicated to me officially either from the bar association or anyone else authorized to do so. I had a great many documents, some early drafts, some changed drafts, which may be the same as those documents, but I have no means whatsoever of knowing until I see the document from which Mr. Diefenbaker quoted. I give Mr. Fulton credit that he did not quote from any of these. I said in the House that since my department was being attacked on the strength of those documents I ought to be allowed to see the whole charge and not his selected bits and pieces of the charge. The Speaker ruled that, since this was not a public document, he could not compel Mr. Diefenbaker to table it, and Mr. Diefenbaker apparently prefers to keep it secret, except for the parts that he wants to select.

Now, the reason I think that this document must be different from any document that I have seen was given by Mr. Dickey on page 1276 of *Hansard*. I want to read this because I think it substantiates completely my point that I do not know what this document is or what is in it. Mr. Dickey says, in the last paragraph of the first column on page 1276 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, the final point with which I wish to deal—and I believe it is important that I do so—is in connection with the assertion that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Harris) who was then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration refused to see this subcommittee. That statement is not in the report; nor, so far as I can find or discover, is it in any document emanating from any member of the committee, either as a member of the committee or in his personal capacity. This statement did appear in a

press report as an unidentified statement, and it did not come to my attention until several weeks after the meeting in Winnipeg was over. When it did come to my attention I immediately got in touch with the chairman of the subcommittee to discover how that impression had been given, and to arrange for a public denial of it.

That statement was quoted by Mr. Diefenbaker as being in the document from which he was quoting, which is the document I have never been allowed to see. It is in no document I have been allowed to see and I can only assume that this document of Mr. Diefenbaker's is different in some respect to any document I have ever seen.

As Mr. McLeod said, I would like to see the document which is supposed to be the justification for calling these gentlemen here. I think if the committee could see and read the full document we might take a different view as to whether they ought to be called. I do not think it is fair or reasonable to ask you to make that judgment on bits and pieces.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, the Minister when he was speaking referred to having seen a document which he considered to be confidential. Evidently he had reference to the one which he subsequently put on *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. I said that the deputy minister had shown me any documents he had been given in confidence. I have seen a great many documents, I do not deny that for a minute, but the only document I put on *Hansard* was the one published in Winnipeg. It is very very confusing to those of us who cannot see all the documents.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): But nevertheless, Mr. Minister, I would call to your attention that you did say at one point definitely that you had not seen this document.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have not seen the document Mr. Diefenbaker had.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Later you said this was a document, but that it was a confidential document. You will agree with me that possibly you were being cautious and not prepared to say you had seen a document which was confidential.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that question is cleared up.

Mr. FULTON: On this point, Mr. Chairman, the minister has stated that the documents were received in confidence. My understanding is that they were not given to the department in confidence. They were given to the department as a frank disclosure of what was in the minds of the committee and what would form the basis of their report at the Canadian Bar Association convention. I think that that is borne out. That is borne out by the fact that, as the minister has admitted, he has had all the documents, all the working papers, forming the basis of the official report of the subcommittee.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: We do not know that.

Mr. FULTON: I state that as a fact and suggest that if it is questioned the only way to clear it up is to call the witnesses.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Table the document.

Mr. FULTON: I would prefer that the witnesses come here and table the documents themselves. They are not my documents; they are theirs.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And they are not mine.

Mr. FULTON: They were given to the deputy minister for communication to the minister, as is shown where they are referred to in the report. I will read it:

> "However, the committee and particularly Mr. Taylor, the author, believe that until such time as the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration"

—Mr. Pickersgill—

"has had an opportunity of reviewing the detailed material contained in their reports, they should not be generally distributed."

That makes it perfectly clear that the purpose of handing these documents to the deputy minister was so that the Minister would have an opportunity of reviewing them, and I submit again that if they have not been brought to his attention that it is an example of a grave breakdown in the department. They were placed with the deputy minister for that purpose. The Minister was in Newfoundland at the time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was not in Newfoundland when the Canadian Bar Association was meeting.

Mr. FULTON: Very shortly afterwards.

They were given to the deputy minister and the report from which I have read makes it clear that it was for the purpose that they would be reviewed by the minister, and until he had had an opportunity of making that review for the obvious purpose of deciding what action he then felt necessary, they would not be generally distributed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apparently they were only distributed to certain conservative members of the opposition.

Mr. FULTON: That is ridiculous. I have seen them and they are not secret or confidential. They are available to the members of the Canadian Bar Association. They were in the hands of the subcommittee and the Committee on Civil Liberties, and they extended to the minister the courtesy of not making them generally available to the public until he had had an opportunity to review them. Then the minister takes refuge in the statement that they are confidential documents. It is right in the report of the committee that "until such time as the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has had an opportunity of reviewing the detailed material contained in the reports they should not be generally distributed". They were in the hands of the deputy minister for the purpose of being brought to the attention of the minister and studied by the department generally. That is why I made this motion because obviously the minister brushed them aside.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am prepared to deal with them right this minute and with everything in them if I can see them.

Mr. FULTON: And his deputy has stated that there are going to be no changes in this department as a result of the recommendations. If that is the attitude of an official in the department we should get the people here who have all the facts and who will table the documents as their documents. That is all I am asking the committee to do.

Mr. GARLAND: Mr. Fulton, why do you refuse to table the documents?

Mr. FULTON: I shall consider the matter as to whether I will table them if the committee decides that it will not take the obvious course of calling before the committee the people who prepared these documents. If the committee says that it will not do that then I will certainly consider the question of whether or not I should table them myself, but I am not going to table them now because I think they should be tabled by the witnesses who wrote them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think there is one question arising out of what Mr. Fulton has said. I read in the newspapers, and I believe it to be correct, that when this report was submitted to the council of the Canadian Bar Association, the Council did not see fit to accept it but referred it back and suggested that the matter be studied further and that is the reason why he document was never communicated officially to me. Since it was not communicated officially to me I did not feel that I should take any official notice of it. That does not mean I have not read every document that the deputy minister has put into my possession. It does not mean that I am not prepared at any

time to see these documents made public and to deal with everything in them. I would be only too happy to do so, the moment someone authorized to do it will make them public.

Mr. FULTON: But you will not hear the people who prepared them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Let us see the documents and then we will see if the people are worth hearing.

The CHAIRMAN: It is unfortunate that these documents are not available to all the members of the committee and are available only to a few members of the committee. The other members are asked to make decisions on the basis of never having seen the documents.

Mr. FULTON: The committee is asked to hear the witness who made the reports which were the basis of the recommendation of the subcommittee on Civil Liberties.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggested in the House that every member in the House was entitled to see them and the ruling was no. I thought that if it were desirable to hear any of these people the documents could be tabled first and then we could see if it was necessary to call them after the documents were tabled. But, apparently it is thought desirable that these documents be kept from the committee.

Mr. FULTON: I object to that. I have asked that the witnesses be called so that the documents may be tabled in the proper manner. You say it is thought desirable to keep them from the majority of the committee and I would ask you to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I got up on the floor of the House myself about it.

Mr. FULTON: I have asked you to withdraw—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton, I was appointed the chairman of this committee, not you. I would ask you to sit down. If I might continue to explain why I said what I did, I urged on the floor of the House that this document from which the minister of Prince Albert was quoting be tabled so that all members would have knowledge of the whole document. That could have been done by the member for Prince Albert there and then. The Speaker did not feel, under the rules that he was entitled to order him to table it, but there was nothing to prevent the member getting up and saying "Here is the document", but he saw fit to keep that document in his possession. Today I have no idea, except as it has been argued, what is in that document. As a lawyer I know of no judge who will allow a document to be produced and quoted from until he sees that document. I have no idea yet what the entire contents of those documents are. Now, it seems to be unfortunate that the members who do know what is in those documents are withholding that knowledge from the other members of the committee. That is all I said so far as I know. If I said anything further than that that was improper I am sorry, but I was pointing out that I fancied that three quarters of the members of this committee are in exactly the same position as I am that they do not know what is in those documents. As a lawyer I know that a judge will not accept secondary evidence as to the contents of a document; he says: "Produce the document and I will look at it and see what is in it". The member for Prince Albert knows that is a rule of law and deliberately refused to present that document to the members of the House.

Mr. MICHENER: To suggest that a veil of secrecy is being drawn to permit this committee to get the evidence we want seems to be absurd. As I understand the minister's statement he is asking this committee not to hear these witnesses because he himself has not been able to see some of the documents.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. MICHENER: That is about what it amounts to and as far as I am concerned this question of witnesses does not relate to documents at all. Perhaps we should not argue any more today. You are going to deal with the question of whether we will vote or not.

Mr. BYRNE: I am wondering if this should not be taken into consideration; I have received from time to time documents from various labour union officials who seem to be closely in touch with the labour situation and so on who feel that the policy of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is wrong and that we should cut immigration off at this time. If we are going to decide to hear witnesses who presume to know how to run this department the estimates committee will become a Citizenship and Immigration committee, we will be sitting here until this time next year and will not have considered any estimates at all. Our purpose is to enquire how money is being spent, not to determine the policy of the government. I am not going to ask for the calling of any labour unions, although I think they should be heard just as much as any bar association committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that your decision stands as it is now.

The CHAIRMAN: We have 20 minutes left and I wonder if the deputy minister could give us those figures as to the increase in personnel in his department so we would have them on the record.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are not ready with the figures.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I have here a summary of persons admissible under the Immigration Act which I think really answers the question which Mr. Thatcher asked the other day. I think the simplest thing to do would be to pass this around so that all the members of the committee could see it. I might point out that a similar summary was given by my predecessor on the 4th of July, 1952, and is to be found at page 4270 and 4271 of *Hansard* for that year.

Mr. THATCHER: Is this the answer to what I asked you on page 1 of your report, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. You wanted to know for each country what classes of persons were considered admissible.

Mr. THATCHER: Could we table it and then perhaps I could query the minister on it tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Fine. As a matter of fact it is a little hard to follow until you set the things down with the other documents. I think Mr. Thatcher is very sensible.

The CHAIRMAN: This statement is headed a summary of persons admissible under P.C. 1953-859 of May 26, 1953 as amended by P.C. 1954-973 of June 30, 1954. I take it that it is the wish of the committee that this be printed as part of our minutes of evidence. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Summary of Persons Admissible Under P.C. 1953-859 of May 26th 1953 as Amended by P.C. 1954-973 of June 30th 1954

1. (A) (i) British subjects by birth or by naturalization in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa and citizens of Ireland;

(ii) citizens of the United States of America; and

(iii) citizens of France born in France or in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands;

if such a person has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

(B) Non-nationals in countries named above:

(i) close relatives, in the following classes, sponsored by a legal resident of Canada,

—husband or wife

—son or daughter, brother or sister, step-brother or step-sister, half-brother or half-sister, together with the husband or wife and unmarried children under 21 ("in-laws" are not included)

—father or mother

—grandparents

—single orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age

—fiance(e)s;

(ii) employer applications, when proposed immigrant personally known to applicant;

(iii) cases of exceptional merit;

(iv) refugees.

(C) All non-nationals (except refugees) mentioned above require two years residence in the country where they apply for visa.

2. *From Austria (except Soviet Zone) Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany (except Soviet Zone), Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands.*

(A) *Nationals:*

(i) Persons in certain trades as approved from time to time, who have funds to pay for their transportation and maintain themselves in Canada until they have secured employment;

(ii) Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (ii), (iii)

(B) *Non-nationals*

Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (ii), (iii), (iv)

3. *From Egypt, Turkey and Labanon*

Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (iii)

3A. *Spain, Portugal*

Person as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (iii)

In cases of Portugal also a selected group of mostly farm workers on an understanding with Portuguese authorities.

4. *From Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Trans Jordan, Syria*

Close relatives in the following classes, sponsored by a legal resident of Canada:

—wives
—children under 18 years of age
—widows accompanied by their children under 18 years of age
—men over 65 years of age
—women over 60 years of age

5. *From Israel*

Persons as in paragraph 4; plus husbands and parents subject 2 year residence rule.

6. *Other Parts of Europe Not Hereabove Mentioned*

Persons as in paragraph 4

7. *From South America*

Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (iii)

8. *From British West Indies*

Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (iii)

9. *From Central America*

Persons as in paragraph 4.

10. *From India, Pakistan and Ceylon*

Husband, wife or unmarried children under 21 years of age of a Canadian citizen legally admitted to and resident in Canada, plus those admissible under the agreement with India (150), Pakistan (100) and Ceylon (50)

11. *For other Asians*

Wife, husband or unmarried children under 21 years of age of any Canadian citizen resident in Canada.

12. *From All Other Countries*

Persons as in paragraphs 1 (B) (i), (iii)

28th February, 1955.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am able to answer Mr. Cameron's question about the amount paid out by the department in legal fees to counsel retained outside the government service. The two branches of the department which have required legal services are Immigration and Indian Affairs. I have the figures separately and the totals as well: Immigration; in the fiscal year 1952-53, $11,057.50, in 1953-54, $14,185.13, in 1954-55 to January 31, 1955 $10,724.90. For Indian Affairs the corresponding figures are 1952-53 $14,007.58, 1953-54 $16,936.13, 1954-55 to January 31, 1955, $9,346.75. The totals are 1952-53, $25,065.08, 1953-54, $31,121.26, 1954-55 to January 31, 1955, $20,071.65.

Mr. NESBITT: On two other occasions I asked if Mr. Smith had a list of questions asked immigrants when they were seeking admission to Canada as to their civil status.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I intended to have a copy for every member of the committee.

Mr. NESBITT: Perhaps you will have extra copies at the next meeting.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We will give them perhaps to Mr. Nesbitt now. These are the same forms I tabled yesterday afternoon in the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that it is necessary to put these in the proceedings but we will make them available to all members of the committee.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could the minister or Mr. Smith tell us the answer to another question about who does the screening?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am afraid our research is not yet complete on that. It may be that I will not be able to give an answer to that until next week.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, are there any other questions which the committee wish to ask?

Mr. MINISTER: When do you expect the general study of the increase in personnel of the department as a whole will be ready?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: At the very beginning of the meeting tomorrow. I thought I would have it ready today but it turned out at the last moment that one of the figures for the first fiscal year was in some doubt and I did not want, if I could avoid it, to give the committee information which would subsequently have to be amended because it was incorrect.

Mr. MCLEOD: I have one other point before we get down to the real study of the estimates. It is on the matter of sponsorship for immigrants. Is it all right to speak about that now?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Certainly.

Mr. MCLEOD: I just happened to be reading an article from the Municipal Association in the Interior of British Columbia where they are criticizing the policy of the sponsorship of immigrants. A lot of these people who have been accepted as sponsors are themselves indigent and on relief and the immigrants which they sponsor also become a charge on the municipality after they have been in this country for one year. Is there no financial responsibility required from sponsors?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, there is.

Mr. MCLEOD: I will read this—which is a statement by the Mayor of the city of Vernon. The sponsor agrees—

> "I also agree that immigrants shall not become a public charge in Canada."

He mentions that he also has cases where they have come to Canada and just as soon as their year is up the immigrants have become charges on the municipality, and he has cases here where the sponsors themselves at the time of sponsoring the immigrant have been indigent or under the care of the municipality. It is quite an article.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be very pleased to have information of that nature because if it is true it should not be true. Our officials are supposed to find out if the sponsor is able to support the immigrant he is sponsoring until such time as that person, in the ordinary course, can be expected to become self supporting. Obviously a sponsor does not have to underwrite him for the rest of his life, but it would certainly not be proper to accept as a sponsor someone who himself is on relief or on the verge of being on relief, unless the sponsored person was someone who was going to come to a job, for instance a son sponsored by his mother who could come and take her off relief. Outside of that kind of situation, a sponsor who is indigent should not be accepted.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Are there not a large amount of immigrants in this country who are not sponsored?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Smith says the sponsored immigrants are about 30 to 40 per cent.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Yes. I attended a meeting similar to what Mr. McLeod mentioned last year at the city hall in Sudbury and at that time there were some 40 or 50 immigrants there and naturally they were complaining

that they were unemployed at that time. I asked them if they were sponsored and who were their sponsors. I was going to go after the sponsors. None of them had been sponsored.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They would be open placement immigrants.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Yes. This is a point similar to Mr. McLeod's.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you identified the paper, Mr. McLeod?

Mr. MCLEOD: I will be glad to give the paper to the minister.

Mr. STARR: In some cases these immigrants have been here a year and have been found to be indigent and had to be helped out by the municipalities at a cost to the taxpayers. Is there any possibility that the government in some way could participate in a period of relief for these people? It seems like a financial hardship on a municipality.

Hon. Mr. PICKERGILL: That point was raised in the debate in the House by Mr. Nesbitt, Mr. White and one or two other members.

Mr. STARR: I had a case which was directed to the minister when I was mayor of the city of Oshawa a few years ago. It was a period of hardship, and some of these immigrants applied for financial aid. The costs were about $1,200. I appealed to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on that score, and he asked us to submit a bill outlining the names of these immigrants. The government settled for only $70 out of this whole $1,200, and the balance was left as a financial burden on them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERGILL: This raises a very big question. As you know, the present policy is for the department to look after indigent immigrants for the first year. The reason for that is that these people have to have some little time to get a chance to find employment and become adapted to the country, perhaps to take a job that does not work out and find another. But I would be rather afraid that, if we assumed an exclusively federal burden for a period much longer than that, we would be turning the immigrants into a preferred class and we would soon have a great storm in this country. I should think that if the federal government said that it would pay the relief for any immigrant for three, four or five years while native born Canadians were not treated as well, there would be trouble. It seems to me that after the first year — it might not be precisely a year, but after a probationary period — one could not do anything that seemed to give the immigrant better treatment than native born Canadians or other Canadian citizens.

Mr. MICHENER: How much was expended under that heading last year, and how much is expected to be this year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that Mr. Smith can tell us that.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose that it would be a relatively small amount in any individual case. Does it include hospitalization?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are agreements with most of the provinces on hospitalization, but I am not sure whether the figures are segregated. $150,000 is provided this year.

Mr. FORTIER: I do not have the expenditures yet.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We can get them for the next meeting.

Mr. DUPUIS: As the status of the minister, or that of any minister that would appear us, is questioned, would it not be well to recommend to the House, which has not established a procedure to follow, that all ministers who appear here as the heads of departments should be ex officio members of the special committee?

The CHAIRMAN: If that were accepted, gentlemen, it would save having somebody drop out tomorrow to make way for the minister.

Mr. DUPUIS: I make a motion to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: To ask that the necessary change be made in the House to permit of the minister, when he is appearing before the committee with his estimates, be an ex officio member of the committee.

Mr. HELLYER: I think that when a minister is appearing before the committee he is in fact a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I mean. Can I take it that it is unanimously agreed?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not agree with that, Mr. Chairman. I do not say this with any disrespect to this minister or any other minister, but I think that it places the whole matter on a wrong footing. I think a minister has to appear before this committee with his deputies and officials to be interrogated by this committee, as a deputy of the committee of the House of Commons, and I do not think that we can very well have people who are in effect witnesses made part of the investigating body.

Mr. DUPUIS: With regard to that, Mr. Chairman, a minister has the responsibility of his department and should not be considered exclusively as a witness.

Mr. HELLYER: I think that the chairman put the case well when he said earlier that this committee was performing the same function as the committee of the whole House. There the minister is not only a witness; he is also a full member of that committee; and I think that he should have exactly the same status here.

The CHAIRMAN: Some members have already left, probably not expecting a new matter such as this to come up. I will take this as notice of a motion, and we will deal with a tomorrow, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. DUPUIS: That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN: The plans are to meet tomorrow at 3:30 p.m. and on Thursday at 10:00 a.m., in order that we may get in two hours and allow the minister to attend a cabinet meeting. The meeting is adjourned until tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 5

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Pickersgill be substituted for that of Mr. Power (*St. John's West*) on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

54421—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1955.
(6)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Pickersgill, Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister, Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

Mr. Fulton raised a Question of Privilege relating to the naming of Mr. Pickersgill to the membership of the Committee. Following a statement by the Minister, the Chairman ruled that there was no Question of Privilege.

The Chairman ruled that the motion moved on March 1, 1955, by Mr. Fulton and seconded by Mr. Michener, relating to the calling of certain witnesses, was out of order.

The ruling of the Chairman having been appealed, it was sustained on the following recorded division:

Yeas: Messrs. Byrne, Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Garland, Hellyer, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Pickersgill,—14.

Nays: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Fulton, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Starr, Thatcher, Yuill,—8.

Two letters received from Mr. John R. Taylor, Barrister, of Vancouver, were read into the record.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

The Minister and his officials supplied information requested at previous meetings.

A Table showing, by Branches, the positions listed in the Departmental Estimates, was presented by the Minister.

Agreed,—That the above mentioned Table be printed. (*See Appendix "B" to this day's Evidence*).

Various forms used by the Immigration Branch were distributed to Committee Members.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Thursday, March 3.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

March 2, 1955

3:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we now have a quorum so if you will come to order we shall proceed.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I am sorry to have to do this; but I want to bring it to the attention of the committee. I do not suppose there is anything we can do about it now, but I do not want the matter to pass without protest.

Yesterday we had a discussion in the committee regarding the position of ministers appearing before the committee and whether they were ipso facto ex officio members or simply in the status of witnesses.

The matter came up again just before the end of the meeting and I have the transcript of yesterday's proceedings here from which I shall now read. Mr. Dupuis said as follows:

> As the status of the minister, or that of any minister that would appear before us, is questioned, would it not be well to recommend to the House, which has not established a procedure to follow, that all ministers who appear here as the heads of departments should be ex officio members of the special committee?
>
> The CHAIRMAN: If that were accepted, gentlemen, it would save having somebody drop out tomorrow to make way for the minister.
>
> Mr. DUPUIS: I make a motion to that effect.
>
> The CHAIRMAN: To ask that the necessary change be made in the House to permit of the minister, when he is appearing before the committee with his estimates, to be an ex officio member of the committee.
>
> Mr. HELLYER: I think that when a minister is appearing before the committee he is in fact a member of the committee.
>
> The CHAIRMAN: That is what I mean. Can I take it that it is unanimously agreed?
>
> Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not agree with that, Mr. Chairman. I do not say this with any disrespect to this minister or any other minister, but I think that it places the whole matter on a wrong footing. I think a minister has to appear before this committee with his deputies and officials to be interrogated by this committee, as a deputy of the committee of the House of Commons, and I do not think we can very well have people who are in effect witnesses made part of the investigating body.
>
> Mr. DUPUIS: With regard to that, Mr. Chairman, a minister has the responsibility of his department and should not be considered exclusively as a witness.
>
> Mr. HELLYER: I think that the chairman put the case well when he said earlier that this committee was performing the same function as the committee of the whole House. There the minister is not only a witness, he is also a full member of that committee, and I think that he should have exactly the same status here.

The CHAIRMAN: Some members have already left, probably not expecting a new matter such as this to come up. I will take this as notice of a motion, and we will deal with it tomorrow, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. DUPUIS: That is all right.

Now, today, Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way: it was the understanding of the members of the committee that this matter would be brought up here and that there would be an opportunity for a discussion of it in the committee, that is, a discussion of the proper status of ministers who appear before us; and I think it was the understanding—certainly my own understanding—that after we had arrived at a decision, we could make an appropriate recommendation to the House, if that should be the decision and desire of the committee. The whole question was certainly before the committee, and it was certainly understood that we should discuss it and settle it, but that has been prevented from being done by the action taken in the House today.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Fulton, it is not a question of privilege at all; it is not a question of privilege and you are out of order; you do not know what is going to be done. So will you please sit down, Mr. Fulton, because I am going to make a ruling.

Mr. FULTON: But Mr. Chairman, there is no point before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, there is a point and it is: that the matter raised is not a question of privilege. I am ruling that it is not a question of privilege.

Mr. FULTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have laid the foundation for a question of privilege which I propose to state and I object to having my point ruled upon by the chairman before I am even given an opportunity to state my question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: The members of the committee understand this action.

Mr. FULTON: But I have not stated my question of privilege yet, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Well I ruled what you have stated was not a question of privilege.

Mr. FULTON: But I have not stated it yet.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the point raised.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, suppose you let him make it.

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to run this committee according to the rules, and I do not propose to be dictated to by members of the opposition. Yesterday I relaxed the rules in order to give the opposition every possible opportunity to put forward its view; and I pointed out over and over again that a motion was being proposed which was out of order. The opposition is not going to take over this committee, or a few members of the opposition who may have that in mind. State your question of privilege if you consider you have not done so and I will hear it.

Mr. FULTON: The question of privilege is that as a result of your statement yesterday it was the understanding of the members of the committee that they would have an opportunity to deal with this whole question of the status of ministers here in the committee; nevertheless by the action which was taken in the House today you have placed us in a position where it is not possible for that discussion to take place. My question of privilege is that I am objecting to the action taken by the chairman as constituting the exact reverse of what the chairman stated he would do yesterday.

I request that the chairman move in the House tomorrow a motion—which would have the effect of removing the minister as a member of the committee until this committee has had an opportunity to discuss the matter, and to

leave the matter in that position until the committee has had that opportunity and until the discussion has taken place. In that way, the point which you stated yesterday would be then placed before the committee for discussion, could be disposed of by us.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I am now a member of the committee and I rise to a point of order. Yesterday I was treated as neither fish, flesh nor fowl. I was accused of dragging red herrings into this committee, and I was not allowed to reply at a time when a member of the committee would have been allowed to reply, to allegations which were made about my department and then about my personal conduct.

So I went to the government whip myself and asked him—after getting the consent of a member of this committee—to allow me to be substituted for that member. I believe the substitution of one member of the same party for another has always been agreed to by the House of Commons. It was I who asked to have that motion made. Nobody else did. And the motion was made in the House of Commons which, I believe, is superior to this committee.

It was a debatable motion and Mr. Fulton or anybody else could have got up in the House this afternoon and debated it, but no one did and I think it is disrespectful to the House to be suggesting here in the committee that what the House saw fit to do, without a single dissenting voice, should be questioned.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. I was about to make a ruling.

Mr. FULTON: The iron curtain is descending.

The CHAIRMAN: What did you say?

Mr. FULTON: I said that the iron curtain is descending.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask you to withdraw that, Mr. Fulton. The iron curtain is not descending. I said I proposed to make a ruling. I ask you to withdraw your remark.

Mr. FULTON: Upon what grounds?

The CHAIRMAN: That it is unparliamentary. There is no iron curtain in this committee and I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. FULTON: On what grounds do you say it is unparliamentary?

The CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that it is unparliamentary and I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Chairman, as I understand Mr. Fulton's argument, it is that a committee ruling should overrule a decision of the House. That would be ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not the first point before us now. Mr. Fulton made a reflection upon me suggesting that when I said I wished to make a ruling that I was causing the iron curtain to descend. I must ask Mr. Fulton to withdraw that.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is customary to allow members of the committee to speak on a point of order before you make a ruling. When Mr. Thatcher rose to do so, you told him to sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: I will rule on your question of privilege, and then Mr. Thatcher can speak. I am curious to know, for the purposes of further handling of this committee, if you are withdrawing your suggestion. I am about to make a ruling, and I must ask the member to resume his seat. Before I do so, as to this question of the iron curtain descending, I want to know if you are ready to withdraw that remark or not.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Pickersgill rose on a point of order and Mr. Thatcher sought to speak upon the point of order and you said: "Sit down, I am going to make a ruling." I submit that he should have an opportunity to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The question of privilege you raised has to be dealt with first. I am running this committee and if I am wrong in ruling that a question of privilege has to be dealt with first it is a matter entirely of my responsibility. However I rule that the question of privilege has to be dealt with first. You raised a question of privilege.

Mr. CANNON: It was brought up before and it should be dealt with first, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly, and I now propose to give a ruling. You interrupted me repeatedly yesterday until finally you were asked, even by a member of your own party, to sit down. You had to be asked repeatedly to take your seat. You are not going to make remarks like that, and you are not going to take over this committee.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I am merely seeking to see that the rules are complied with. You may be as abusive as you wish.

The CHAIRMAN: You will get the rules complied with. I rule that this is not a question which has been properly raised because the House has already dealt with the question and has made the minister a member of our committee. Since the House has already dealt with it, there is no question of privilege whatever. The House has already dealt with the matter of the minister being on this committee. Therefore, we do not have the right to deal with it at all, so your question of privilege was not properly raised and it was entirely out of order. That is my ruling.

Mr. FULTON: Are you not aware that in the House of Commons it is not permitted, under our rules, to refer to the proceedings of a committee which has not yet reported? Therefore it would have been impossible to debate the motion that Mr. Pickersgill be made a member of this committee on the basis of the statement made in the committee, because we could not refer to it. The members of the committee were placed in such a position that they could do nothing but accept the motion which was made in the House and contrary to the understanding which was arrived at yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Anybody could have got up in the House today and objected to the motion to make Mr. Pickersgill a member of this committee. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BYRNE: Is it not true also, Mr. Chairman, that this question of the position of a minister appearing before the committee could still be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr. BYRNE: I do not see, because we have a new member on the committee that it precludes any discussion. Mr. Fulton has also been put on this committee as a new member. A previous subject which had been disposed of by this committee has been re-instituted and we have spent two days now discussing that. I see no reason to discuss this question of the minister's position or that of any other minister. Let us not be childish.

The CHAIRMAN: I was about to point out that Mr. Fulton had no idea whether it was intended to discuss this thing later on and his question of privilege was entirely out of order. I so rule. On the question of the point of order raised by the minister—.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What was his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: It was that he was made a member of this committee by the House and was prepared to take his place in the committee. I consider

there is no further necessity of dealing with that. So, there is no point of order before us to speak to.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Then there was no point of order. Was there a point of order?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: My point of order was briefly this, that the House which is the master of the committee had decided without a dissenting voice that I was a member of the committee and therefore I am a member of the committee. The question of the propriety of my becoming a member of the committee could have been raised in the House but should not have been raised in the committee.

Mr. FULTON: On that point of order—if it is a point of order—that question could not have been raised in the House. We could not refer in the House to what took place in the committee and the minister knows that very well.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If Mr. Fulton has concluded, I will point out, still on my point of order, that the question of the position of ministers in the committee—not this particular minister but ministers generally—could have been very easily raised in the House as a matter of principle on that motion today without reference to anything that had happened in this committee if Mr. Fulton had been quick enough to think about it.

The CHAIRMAN: That is really a question of dealing with the question of privilege which Mr. Fulton purported to raise and which is no question of privilege whatever and which he should have known.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps it was in the same class as the minister's point of order.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask a question about the minister's position as he understands it to be. It seems to me he is in a dual capacity here; first as a member of the committee and entitled to all the rights and privileges and the disabilities of other members of the committee, and secondly that he is here as a minister to answer for requests for funds with which we are dealing.

The CHAIRMAN: Why are you speaking, Mr. Michener? What is your point?

Mr. FULTON: Because he happens to be a member of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER: I am asking a question of the minister if I may.

The CHAIRMAN: That is out of order. It is not up to the minister to interpret his rights now that he is a member of this committee. He has the rights the rules give him. I rule your question out of order, Mr. Michener. Will you resume your seat please.

Mr. DUPUIS: We are going to have to appoint another minister so that there will be one who will be a member of the committee and one who will be a minister.

Mr. MICHENER: I should like to speak to the point which the minister last made that there was an opportunity in the House to deal with his status at the time the motion was put. May I say that the motion was put and carried so rapidly that no one on the floor—

The CHAIRMAN: You are out of order because you are reflecting in this committee on proceedings in the House of Commons.

Now, if I may proceed with what was indicated yesterday as the first order of business Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Michener:

> That Mr. John H. McDonald, barrister of Ottawa, and Mr. John R. Taylor, barrister of Vancouver, and Mr. John H. Dickey, member for Halifax—

Mr. FULTON: That was an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: You accepted it.

Mr. FULTON: If it was in order.

The CHAIRMAN: I am reading it because you accepted it.

Mr. FULTON: Very well.

The CHAIRMAN:

> be called to give evidence before the committee as to the results of their investigation into the administration of the Immigration Act and as to any other matters arising therefrom on which the committee may deem it proper to question them; and that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard.

A point of order having been raised that the question of asking for power to call witnesses had been decided at a previous meeting, I said that in order to study the problem I would defer my ruling until the next meeting. I indicated pretty definitely what I understood the ruling should be in regard to this motion yesterday. Since then I have had an opportunity to consult the various books of procedure. I would refer the committee to paragraph 383 of Beauchesne's 2nd edition which reads as follows:

> An old rule of Parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion of motions of the same nature and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session.

It goes on at paragraph 384:

> It is a rule in both Houses, which is essential to the due performance of their duties that no question or bill shall be offered that is substantially the same as one on which their judgment has already been expressed in the current session.

Then, at paragraph 386:

> A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which, during the current session, has been decided.

Of course, the rule is well known by the committee that we are governed by the rules which govern the House. I also refer the committee to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, fourth edition at page 328. I will quote shortly from it:

> It is, however, an ancient rule of parliament that 'no question or motion can regularly be offered if it is substantially the same with one on which the judgment of the House has already been expressed during the current session'.

Then, it goes on to speak about attempts to evade the rule by moving a motion that is somewhat different and at the bottom of page 329 it says:

> The English journals are full of examples of the evasion of the rule which the house has permitted. In all such cases, the character of the motion has been changed sufficiently to enable the member interested to bring it before the house. Such motions, however, must be very carefully considered, in order to guard against a palpable violation of a wholesome rule.

I have looked at the other authorities on procedure and have consulted the clerk and there seems to be no question whatever that this motion, under the rules of parliament which are applicable to this committee, is completely and without doubt out of order and I so rule.

Mr. FULTON: Will you permit debate on your ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I appeal your ruling and point out that I have before me the proceedings of the Veterans Affairs committee of 1946 in which you took an exactly opposite position.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not intend to permit the rules to be further violated to the extent that they were yesterday.

Now gentlemen, I made a ruling that the motion of Mr. Fulton is out of order. Mr. Fulton has appealed from my ruling and I ask those in favour of my ruling to say yea.

Mr. FULTON: Will you put the question to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: You wish the committee to be polled?

Mr. FULTON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk will call the names.

The CLERK: Ayes 14, nays 8.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair is sustained, and we shall proceed with consideration of the matters before the committee.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder whether the minister would care to table those documents.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to make a statement on that right away. I examined my files last night to make sure, if I possibly could, that the statement I made when I was, after all, taken rather by surprise and was rather in the curious state of being suspended between two worlds, was a correct statement of the facts. I consulted my files and found what I knew to be there—a letter sent to me by Mr. J. R. Taylor from Calgary. It had no date on it, but it was received in my office on the 7th of September and the internal evidence makes perfectly clear, I think, the approximate date of its posting, that is it was after the meeting of the Bar Association. This letter was sent to me by Mr. Taylor, to inform me of what had happened at the Bar Association, and as it happens it is the only communication that I received from any member of the Bar Association. He was writing, I take it, in a personal capacity, but it happens to be the only communication sent to me as minister by a member of that association and as it relates directly to these documents I think it would be unfair of me not to make its contents available to the committee.

I would prefer to table the typewritten copy but if anyone should doubt that I am using the official document I shall be quite ready to table the document itself. I would like to read it now.

Canadian Pacific Hotels

Hotel Palliser,
Calgary, Alta.

Re Canadian Bar Subcommittee—Immigration

Dear Mr. Pickersgill:

I am just passing through Calgary en route to Vancouver. I have a few minutes so I felt that I should write to you briefly about the week's activities.

1. I am bitter about the way the whole thing was handled. I have worked long and hard on this subcommittee. I desired that my reports be filed with the association but be not circulated. I understand John McDonald will be giving you a copy of his report—you will notice on page 2 of his report that mention is made that I desired 'particularly' that the reports be not circulated.

2. Before leaving Ottawa I wrote Mr. Fortier about the reports and referred to the withholding of any reports he took exception to and I said that the committee would in all probability withhold distribution of the reports. This was done.

3. At Winnipeg Mr. Fortier said he did not take exception to any of the reports and did not care if they were distributed. This was confirmed by his letter to me.

4. While I was personally pleased to see Mr. Fortier at the convention his presence attracted great interest. The Winnipeg papers had an item about him in the papers before the meeting. After the meeting both Winnipeg papers stated that his presence attracted 'suspicion'.

5. If you read the transcript of the meeting you will notice that Mr. M. McFarlane, past president of the Vancouver Bar Assn., stated that at a meeting of the B.C. section of the Canadian Bar Association some 40 lawyers 'unanimously' recommended certain changes in procedure. Mr. McFarlane in his remarks used the word 'shocking'. This word was also used by Mr. McDonald. I was not at the B.C. meeting and do not know everything that took place. At the meeting in Winnipeg I said nothing.

6. The report filed by Mr. McDonald was approved by all members of the committee. Item 9 was worded differently in the draft report. Item 9 as finally drafted is Mr. Dickey's wording and he is the author of this section. This wording is a credit to Mr. Dickey; I mention item 9 only to put an end to any rumour that the committee was not working in concert.

7. I believe that the meeting would have ended in an orderly way and without publicity if the following had not occurred:

(*a*) if Mr. Fortier had not been present. His presence attracted attention as indicated. But the plans of the committee were upset and we were made uneasy when Mr. Fortier, before the meeting ended, invited all (presumably including the many reporters in the room) to meet with him the next day. At the time I felt that the idea to meet was a good one but within an hour after the official meeting ended many rumours were circulating and many peculiar statements were made. It was then that Mr. McDonald, as chairman, met the press. I also made statements. If you eliminate the sensational headlines you will find that the reports are fairly accurate. I felt that Mr. McDonald handled the situation very well—he could easily have made things worse by distributing the reports. (And apparently the dept. did not care whether this was done or not.)

(*b*) Mr. McDonald was personally upset about the matter.

(i) as chairman he got no cooperation from the dept.

(ii) While it was obvious to anyone that there was a paucity of rules and regulations the dept. took the attitude that the situation was excellent and that no changes were to be made.

8. In Mr. Dickey's letter to Mr. McDonald he stated that the committee should continue its work for another year. The Bar Association has instructed the committee to continue. I do not know how long I will serve. At some convenient time (and when no publicity will be attracted to it) I desire to resign. At the present time there is much interference—but I do hope that in the days to come you will give this committee—no matter who is serving—some cooperation.

9. I told Mr. Fortier before he left Winnipeg that I desired to get back to my law practice and to try and forget this hectic week. Incidentally, I have been away from my office for a year and a half because of a physical breakdown. For this reason too, I do not desire to carry on any fight with the department. But I am prepared to do so if any recriminating statements are made about me or concerning me. I have acted in the best of faith—changes are necessary and if they are made all lawyers and all Canadians will benefit.

In a letter which I drafted in Montreal (to be sent to Mr. Harris but never sent) I said that 'I had personally made every effort to reform the system.

(a) I had written "hundreds" of letters to the dept. about the situation from 1947-1954.

(b) I discussed the issues with you in your suite in the Hotel Vancouver in the spring of 1950. You felt that the changes I was advocating were most reasonable. You made notes of what I said. Not one change was made.

(c) I have taken the matter up with the Vancouver Bar Association and the Canadian Bar Association . . .'

In my draft letter to Mr. Harris I referred to 2 or 3 shocking things. If we meet I will pass them on to you. At this late date no good purpose can be served in making these things public. The present ills can be cured by taking action on the recommendations made. Whether or not you do this is for you to decide.

I see that I must catch my train. I do hope that this row will not be continued in public. It was the immigration dept. that 'maintained' me for 25 years—I hope before long that I can pay public compliment to it.

Yours truly,
J. R. Taylor.

P.S. Please convey my regards to Mr. Fortier.

I want to refer at once to that one reference to myself in 9 (b) in that letter. I have not the slightest doubt, if Mr. Taylor says so, that he did discuss this matter with me in the Hotel Vancouver in 1950 if I was there in 1950, and I have no doubt I was. I have not really had time to refresh my recollection sufficiently to be able to say whether I was.

Mr. MICHENER: Does he not mean Mr. Harris?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think you are right, Mr. Michener, and that makes my position much easier; because to the best of my knowledge and belief I have never seen Mr. Taylor in my life and I do not know what he looks like. I think that has been explained satisfactorily.

There is only one other comment that I want to make about the contents of this letter. He says, not once but on several occasions, that the department never had the slightest objection to any of these documents being published. That was the view expressed by my deputy minister and it is my view. I would welcome their publication at any time when I am given documents that are certified to me to be the authentic documents by anybody authorized to do so, but up to this moment that situation has never arisen. The only document I have received in any way officially, and even that only through my deputy minister, was the one which I made public. I have tried in this whole matter to give to parliament and to this committee every scrap of

information I have about this subject and to give it truthfully and straightforwardly, and I intend to continue in the same way. If these documents can be laid on the table by somebody authorized to do so or by somebody who wants to do it on his own responsibility, and if anyone in the committee wants to raise any question about anything in them, I will do my best, either personally or through my officials, to explain it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is that letter to be filed?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I do not think that these documents can be tabled and I do not think that they should be tabled. The general committee of the Canadian Bar Association, namely the civil liberties committee, appointed a subcommittee on immigration for certain purposes, and this matter was referred to them for study. An interim report was submitted by this committee to the civil liberties committee of the Canadian Bar Association—I think it was last year—but not accepted by that committee. It was not accepted by the civil liberties section but referred back for further consideration. It is a matter for the Canadian Bar Association. There has been no resolution on it. The lawyers in the Canadian Bar Association have not given final or interim approval to anything in this subcommittee's report. It is an internal matter and has no cause to appear before this committee at all. Any lawyer, such as Mr. Fulton and such as myself, who is a member of the Canadian Bar Association, knows that we do not want to bring up matters appertaining to the association before a parliamentary committee until they have been passed upon and accepted by the national association of lawyers. This whole discussion is out of order. It should not have arisen. It is unimportant who Mr. McDonald is or who Mr. Taylor is or who somebody else is. This is an internal matter of the Canadian Bar Association, and we are wasting our time even talking about a subcommittee whose business has no place before this committee at all.

Mr. CANNON: I agree with that. In my opinion that report has no legal existence at all. It is only a draft report that was made by a subcommittee, and it was not accepted by the committee to which it was referred. It has no legal existence whatever.

Mr. FULTON: The minister has read a letter from Mr. Taylor—and I thank him for having done so—with reference to these documents that have been the subject of some controversy. I also have a letter from Mr. Taylor. As might reasonably be expected, I got in touch with Mr. Taylor. It so happens that Mr. Taylor is down here in this part of the country. He is down here in connection with his work as a continuing member of the immigration committee of the civil liberties section of the Canadian Bar Association. He is also here on some private business as well as some legal business for his firm.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Good for him!

Mr. FULTON: Before I read the letter from Mr. Taylor, I want to correct one thing that Mr. Macnaughton stated, that the report of the subcommittee was not accepted by the civil liberties section.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It was referred for further consideration, and the implication is that it was rejected.

Mr. FULTON: It was accepted by the civil liberties section and was reported by them to the council of the Canadian Bar Association and was referred back by the council for further study and consideration. You said that it was not accepted by the civil liberties section.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It was received but not accepted.

Mr. FULTON: It was accepted and passed on to the council of the Canadian Bar Association. Mr. Taylor's letter is as follows:

"Ottawa,
MARCH 2nd, 1955.

E. D. Fulton, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Fulton:

I am writing in reply to your telephone inquiry of yesterday, as to whether the reports of the Sub-Committee on Immigration of the Canadian Bar Association now in possession of the Deputy Minister and Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, are secret and confidential documents, and also as to whether I can furnish you with a set of these reports for production to the House of Commons now examining the subject.

Before dealing specifically with these questions, I am compelled to comment on the situation generally. It appears to me that a very incorrect impression now exists as to the purpose of these reports, the method and circumstances of their filing and distribution, and as to their nature and effect. Certain not very flattering and quite incorrect remarks are reported to have been made by the Minister as to my own purpose and position. Other inaccurate statements have appeared in the press as to all the circumstances surrounding these reports. I think it is time the record was set straight.

Let me first make it perfectly clear that I have at all times tried to keep this matter under control. The Sub-Committee on Immigration was not set up on my motion. I have, however, devoted over two years of arduous and careful work to the study of the problem as a member of the Sub-Committee. I have at no time made any public statement about the reports. As far as I was concerned, the reports which have become the subject of controversy were not to be generally distributed. The matter first got out of hand when the Deputy Minister attended the Convention at Winnipeg, and made certain comments about the situation.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but on a point of order do you not think that it is going too far? We are involving the Canadian Bar Association in a conflict with a committee on the Department of Citizenship and Immigration estimates.

Mr. FULTON: No.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Surely you as a lawyer want to keep the Canadian Bar Association out of this. What Mr. Taylor thinks or does not think is of extreme unimportance to us.

Mr. FULTON: On the point of order, if it is a point of order, the question has been raised as to whether these documents should be allowed before the committee. I have explained that I got in touch with Mr. Taylor to see if he could supply me with a set for that purpose.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: He is not a member of the committee.

Mr. FULTON: The minister read a letter from Mr. Taylor on this subject into the record of the committee, and I think it is only fair that Mr. Taylor's letter to me should also be read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN: Actually I have very grave doubts as to whether this is in order; however, since the minister has read one letter from Mr. Taylor in regard to these reports, I think it is quite in order to read another letter from

him, a more recent one. So I do not think I should apply the generally accepted rule that letters reflecting on proceedings of committees or the House should not be read.

Mr. FULTON: I think that you will find that the letter does not reflect on the proceedings of the committee.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Merely on the minister.

Mr. FULTON: Continuing the letter reads:

> The matter first got out of hand when the Deputy Minister attended the Convention at Winnipeg, and made certain comments about the situation. Had this not happened, there would probably have been no public controversy. Mr. McDonald's press conference followed as a necessary result of this development. The Minister himself made statements about the reports in a television press conference last fall. He has since made conflicting statements about reports, and other people have made statements about them which conflict with what he said. Some copies were distributed by the Civil Liberties Committee of the Canadian Bar Association. It is essential, therefore, to understand exactly why the reports were prepared and how they were handled.
>
> The Sub-Committee on Immigration was first appointed at the Bar Association Convention in Vancouver in 1952, with Mr. McDonald as Chairman, and Mr. Dickey and myself as members. In order to arrive at valid conclusions, the Sub-Committee decided to undertake a review of the disposition of a number of immigration applications from various parts of the country. These reviews were carried out mainly by myself, but they and their conclusions were discussed at many meetings of two or more members of the Sub-Committee in the interval. An interim report and recommendations were made and approved at the Convention in Quebec in 1953, and the same Sub-Committee was reappointed and instructed to continue its work. This it did in the same manner outlined above. For the purpose of the present review, these studies may be said to have culminated in the four reports now the subject of this controversy, prepared for the Winnipeg Convention in 1954. These reports were compiled for the purpose of enabling the Sub-Committee to arrive at its main report and recommendations for that Convention.
>
> These four reports in question thus constitute an analysis of two years' careful review of numerous cases from all parts of Canada. The main report and recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Immigration, dated 27th August, 1954, was in fact based entirely upon these studies. All members of the Sub-Committee approved the first two reports; all members of the Sub-Committee knew the final two reports were being prepared, and knew their general nature; and all members of the Sub-Committee approved the main report and recommendations, which, as stated, were based on these four studies. It is difficult to see how it can now be reported that any member of the Sub-Committee repudiated any of these documents in advance.
>
> Mr. Dickey, in fact, suggested an amendment to one paragraph of this main report, namely paragraph 9, which certainly appeared to me to have the effect of strengthening the expression of regret of the Sub-Committee that no action had been taken by the department to implement our previous recommendations. His amendment was adopted and incorporated into the main report in its final form.
>
> Copies of two of the reports of these studies, in their final form, were left with the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in Ottawa on or about the 26th August, 1954, and the other two in original form were read and studied by him at that time. Copies of these last

two reports were given to the Deputy Minister at Winnipeg by the writer. The Deputy Minister has, therefore, had in his possession copies of all four documents since the beginning of September, 1954.

None of these reports was ever regarded as a secret or confidential document. They were delivered to the Deputy Minister in the hope, and with the expectation, that he would analyse them and discuss them with the Minister, and that as a result of their own consideration of them, and of such recommendations as the Bar Association might eventually make, action would eventually be taken to remedy the serious administrative weaknesses which, the whole Sub-Committee agreed, were revealed by these studies.

Out of deference to the Minister, however, who had just been newly appointed, it was felt that the studies should not be made available for general distribution until after the Minister had had time to consider them. This is made clear by the following passage in the Sub-Committee's main report of 27th August, already referred to:—

> Copies of these reports are being filed with the Chairman of the Committee on Civil Liberties. However, the Committee, and particularly Mr. Taylor, the author, believe that until such time as the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has had an opportunity of reviewing the detailed material contained in these reports, they should not be generally distributed.

May I add that it was the wish of the Chairman of the Sub-Committee, and of Mr. Dickey, and concurred in by myself, that as a matter of courtesy and in order to establish a basis of cooperation, and also so that no one would feel that he was being taken by surprise, copies of all documents prepared by or for the Sub-Committee should be thus filed with the Minister. This practice was followed over the full period of two years, although to be perfectly accurate, on several occasions as a matter of convenience for both sides, the documents were not actually delivered to the Minister but were filed with the Deputy Minister, it being understood that they would thus come to the Minister's attention. It is within my knowledge that copies of reports prepared by the B.C. Sub-section of the Civil Liberties Committee were similarly filed.

From what I have read of the debates in the House, and have seen reported in the press as far back as last fall, it is now apparent that the Minister has read these documents, and does not appear to regard them as being of any consequence. It does not come within my province, in my capacity as a continuing member of the Canadian Bar Association Sub-Committee on Immigration, to make any comment here on this fact, beyond expressing my regret at his attitude. It will be for the Bar Association to reach and express any final conclusions in this regard.

Now to deal with your inquiries specifically. May I point out that the Sub-Committee on Immigration has been reappointed by the Canadian Bar Association and instructed to continue its work. The four reports in question are to form the basis of this continuing study. Mr. McDonald and myself have been reappointed as members. Under these circumstances, I must regretfully conclude that since they form as it were the working papers for a task on which I and the other Sub-Commmittee members are actually now embarked, it would hardly be appropriate for me to forward you a set of these reports for the specific purpose of production to your Committee, in the controversial atmosphere which now apparently prevails. But I think I should be permitted to point out that

the facts that the Canadian Bar Association has reappointed Mr. McDonald and myself as members of a committee to continue these studies, and that the reports in question are to form the starting point of these studies, seem to dispose of the unfair suggestions which have been made by the Minister that the reports should be dismissed because they were compiled by a disgruntled pleader and a reckless politician respectively.

"As to the question whether the documents as handed to the Deputy Minister were secret or confidential documents, I think what has been previously said makes it obvious that they were not. Indeed, the very circumstances that copies were handed to the Deputy Minister at Winnipeg while the meeting was in progress and controversy was raging, and that the Minister himself subsequently made reference to the reports in a television press conference, would seem effectively to dispose of any suggestion that they were secret or confidential documents. Under all the circumstances, it must be obvious that documents placed in the Minister's possession in this manner could be used by the Minister in any way that he himself deems proper, and I and no one else in my position could have any objection, provided he did so fairly and accurately.

I think it remains only for me to say that while it would not be appropriate for me to comment in any way upon what may be the decision of the House of Commons Committee, I should be glad to appear at any time before such a committee and to discuss with them the basis upon which I carried on my investigation, its extent, and my own conclusions.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) J. R .TAYLOR.
John R. Taylor.

And then there is a "P.S."

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There is just the one signature?

Mr. FULTON: Yes. This is a letter from Mr. Taylor in reply to my specific questions asking him if he could provide me with a set of the documents to produce to the commitee, and whether so far as he was concerned the documents he supplied to the Minister were private or were secret or confidential documents.

I shall now refer to the P.S., if the committee wishes me to read it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I would like to have it read.

Mr. FULTON (reads):

P.S. The documents to which I refer, and which have been furnished to the Deputy Minister, are as follows:—

1. Main report and recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Immigration signed at Ottawa on August 27th, 1954.
2. Report entitled 'Report to the Members of the Canadian Bar Association by the Sub-Committee on Immigration' dated July 13th, 1954, with seventeen pages being copies of letters referring to immigration cases attached thereto.
3. Report entitled 'Canadian Bar Association Sub-Committee of Civil Liberties dealing with Immigration' dated July 20th, 1954.
4. Report entitled 'Canadian Bar Association Sub-Committee of Civil Liberties dealing with Immigration' dated August 5th, 1954.
5. Report entitled 'Canadian Bar Association Sub-Committee of Civil Liberties dealing with Immigration' dated August 10th, 1954.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two statements about me in that letter and perhaps I ought to try to clear them up as factually as I can, as nearly as I can remember them. You do not happen to have a copy? In the first place I have never been flattered by being asked to go on a television press conference. I have been on an ordinary radio press conference, however. That is not important. But as to the question about the nature of the documents which were handed to the deputy minister and shown to me, as I stated to the committee yesterday, to the best of my knowledge and belief—and it would seem to be confirmed by everything I can apprehend from the letter in listening to it read—the documents which the deputy minister showed to me are the same documents as those described in this letter. There just seems to be one misunderstanding about the whole thing and this may conceivably be my fault. I understood that these documents were given to the deputy minister for his information and for my information in a private way so that Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald—Mr. Dickey was not there at all any time I was minister—could get the views of the department, and they got a good deal of co-operation from the department which I could describe if it were of any interest. I do not think it is particularly. But, when I read in the newspapers, and when I heard from the deputy minister, that, instead of this report being accepted by the Canadian Bar Association and forwarded to me for consideration, it had been referred back for further study for another year, and when I received no communication from any officer of the Canadian Bar Association transmitting any of these documents to me in an official way, I did not see how I could take any official cognizance of them. But, I do not want to be pedantic about it. I was not sure; maybe the deputy minister was sure; but, I was not sure whether these documents which had been shown to me by the deputy minister—and which the letter to Mr. Fulton indicates had various dates, some of them in July and some of them in August—were the final versions that had been referred to in the one document that was made public or whether they were earlier versions, because in addition to these documents I understand that the deputy was shown several earlier versions that were later amended. I read and I read with great interest, the documents which the deputy minister had, and I must say that the opinion I formed of them does not correspond with the opinion Mr. Taylor formed of them. But, he was apparently their author and I am merely a critic and it is not surprising perhaps that we do not share the same view of them. I did read them, and I considered the recommendations in the one document that was made public with great care and if anyone wants to cross-question me about those recommendations I would be very glad to be cross-questioned. Also if anyone wishes to place these other four documents on the table here on his responsibility so that all the members can see them I will be very glad to be cross-questioned about anything in any of them, but I am not going to project myself into an internal affair of the Canadian Bar Association which the Canadian Bar Association has not yet determined.

Mr. CANNON: These are the four documents that are mentioned in the postscript to the letter. Are they signed by all members of the committee? Are they a report of the committee signed by all the members.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I happen to have the letter in my hand now and there is no evidence to that effect.

Mr. CANNON: If the documents that are referred to are documents which emanated from the whole committee then the opinion of Mr. Taylor as one individual is not worth an awful lot.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: May I suggest that the time has come to take the Canadian Bar Association out of politics in order to discuss the estimates referred to us.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am prepared to give the breakdown Mr. Thatcher asked for yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly this letter indicated that the reports were not to be circulated and are still under study by the Canadian Bar Association and I can understand the minister not wishing to violate this understanding he has of the basis on which he got the documents. So, if they are not in any way before the committee I suppose what we should do is to proceed with the study of the estimates.

Mr. FULTON: Is the minister prepared to accept the invitation in the letter, and table them on his responsibility on the basis they were not handed in with the intention that they were to be secret and confidential documents as the letter makes clear?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I am not prepared to take the word of Mr. Taylor who is a junior member of this committee of the Canadian Bar Association. I am rather surprised that Mr. Fulton, if he wanted information about this committee, did not go to the gentleman who lives in Ottawa who was the chairman of this subcommittee and get a letter from him. I think it would be very interesting to have one and for my part I would be very glad to have one and have it read.

Mr. FULTON: Again the minister is attempting to avoid this by a step sideways. The minister said before that the documents were received by him on the understanding that they were secret and confidential. With regard to that understanding I went to the person who prepared the documents and his answer is there and will speak for itself.

Mr. BYRNE: We have decided that we are not going to send for documents and people and we are here to discuss these estimates. I am interested in carrying on the business we were sent here for. I have not asked for those documents as a member of the committee. I am interested in carrying on the business we were sent here for.

Mr. FULTON: I was asked to table them yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton has explained why he is not in a position to table them and the minister has read a letter, which draws attention to page 2 of the report, where—this gentleman writing the letter to Mr. Fulton—Mr. Taylor states that he particularly desired the reports be not circulated.

Mr. FULTON: But, Mr. Chairman, only until the minister had an opportunity to study it.

The CHAIRMAN: Then he said: "that the committee would in all probability withhold distribution of the reports."
As I understand this whole thing it is still under study by the Canadian Bar Association and unless there is some person in an official capacity in the Canadian Bar Association prepared to authorize the release of these documents I do not think that the minister would be justified in releasing them in violation of the terms on which he received them. The minister is in this position: if there is anybody who has the right to table them that person should take the responsibility. He has proved that he received them under such terms that he would be violating a confidence if he circulated them. The committee has no right to ask him to violate the confidence in which he received these reports and has no right to feel that he is doing wrong in raising the question. I think that every member of this committee would feel that he is doing exactly as they would want him to do, and that being the case it seems to me that we should proceed to deal with any questions which any member of the committee wishes to deal with. If we have got some information from these reports on which they want to base some questions, well and good, but

I do not think that we should be concerned any more about these particular documents as such because I do not think that they are properly in front of us, and it looks as if there is no way that they can be brought properly before us.

I now suggest that we do the work which we were set up to do.

Mr. MICHENER: I am in agreement with what has been said, Mr. Chairman, that we should now get on with our work. I should like to say one thing, perhaps, on the Canadian Bar Association—and there are a number of lawyers here: none of us wants to bring the Canadian Bar Association as such into this matter because it has not reported and I do not think there should be any suggestion on our part that these documents are the official findings or report of the Canadian Bar Association. They were prepared in the course of a study being made by the Canadian Bar Association, and I felt as did Mr. Fulton that we should hear Mr. Taylor because he had for a year or more made a considerable study of some of the cases and undoubtedly had some views which would be of interest: in other words that he should be heard as a man who had made such a study, not a representative of the Canadian Bar; and I still think the committee should keep this suggestion in mind because Mr. Taylor is available and would be an interesting witness.

Mr. FULTON: The minister has, of course, to exercise his discretion, and I suggest to him now that it is clear from the terms of that letter that he is obviously at liberty to use the documents as he sees fit; and it is for that reason that I ask the minister if he is prepared to table them or make them available to us. The minister has said himself he would like to see them tabled, and would welcome the opportunity of discussing the documents because "there was nothing in them."

Mr. CANNON: As a member of the Canadian Bar Association, Mr. Chairman, may I say I am of the same opinion as Mr. Michener, and agree that the Bar Association should not be brought into this matter in any way, and that it is unfair to the Canadian Bar Association to suggest that these documents should be tabled here. They are only working papers. Please do not interrupt me. They are only documents, working papers one might say, and it is absolutely unfair to table here papers which are not a report of the Canadian Bar Association and create an impression among the public that they are in fact reports of the Canadian Bar Association or that the Canadian Bar Association is mixed up in this matter in any way.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Cannon has said better than I can what I was about to say. Mr. Fulton said these documents were given to me to use as I saw fit, and that is precisely the way I intend to use them. In my opinion these documents were papers which Mr. Taylor was working on as one member of a committee. He gave them to me through the deputy minister so that I could see what he was doing. He was not doing them for my department; he was doing them as a matter of trust for the Canadian Bar Association and I received them on that basis, and on that basis I shall keep them until such time as a properly authorized officer of the Canadian Bar Association tells me I can use them in some other way.

Mr. Taylor, who is a junior member of a subcommittee is not in my opinion an authorized officer of the Canadian Bar Association who can give me that authority.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yesterday the hon. minister rather horrified me by suggesting I had cast doubts on his veracity. I stated, however, that on the contrary I was only confused by what he had said. Having heard him today I am left in even more confusion. I gathered the minister had seen those documents—

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Improperly.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Will you wait a moment? In yesterday's transcript of evidence the hon. Mr. Pickersgill, on page B-1, had this to say:

> The most serious part of this is that Mr. Fulton is basing his motion on documents which I have never yet seen.

It may well be that the hon. minister—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Did I not go right on to say that they might be the same or very similar documents?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): You did not say it here, and furthermore, later —just a moment, I will read the whole thing. Members of the committee opposite me are anxious to interrupt. They were very anxious to have these documents filed yesterday. Now they are not so anxious. I am not a lawyer so I do not understand why they have changed their views. I am a simple innocent faced with the evidence as it appears down on paper.

The Hon. Mr. Pickersgill was afraid that I was casting doubts on his veracity yesterday, and I was horrified at his suggestion. He said this:

> The most serious part of this is that Mr. Fulton is basing his motion on documents which I have never yet seen.

Mr. Fulton then jumped ten feet and said:

> I insist on the right of reply to that.

Then Mr. Pickersgill said:

> I was not allowed to interrupt the honourable gentleman and I hope that I may be allowed to proceed in a consecutive way without interruption.

To which Mr. Fulton replied:

> That would be a right which I did not have.

I continue to quote:

> The Chairman: You were allowed to proceed.
>
> Hon. Mr. Pickersgill: I realize that I am not a member of the committee. I am only the prisoner in the box.

Apparently he is out of the box now.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Out of one box, anyway.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): On page B-2 the hon. minister told us yesterday:

> This document which I placed on *Hansard,* as all members of the committee know, is the only document I received and that document was not sent to me by the Canadian Bar Association.

I am not a lawyer, but perhaps that document comprised the four other documents the minister told us he saw.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No no. I think, Mr. Cameron, I could clear this matter up in two minutes. There are five documents described in the letter Mr. Fulton got from Mr. Taylor.

There is one document which had been made public and which I put on *Hansard,* and there are four others which are described in all sorts of ways—attachments, appendices and so on, and it would now appear from Mr. Taylor's letter that the documents which were given to my deputy minister are the same documents which were given to Mr. Cowan with this published report. But I saw this letter only today, and I have never had any means of knowing that for certain.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): On page B-2 of the report you also said this:

> To the best of my knowledge and belief that is the only document that ever has been made about this meeting in Winnipeg.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not want to reflect on the *Hansard* reporters, but what I intended to say was "never made public," I am sure I did say "public".

The CHAIRMAN: You are reading from the unrevised report.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It makes all the difference.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. minister has just said that until he heard the letter from Mr. Taylor read he had no opportunity of knowing whether the documents he had were in their final form. I would point out that the deputy minister was given copies of two of the documents in final form on or about August 26. The other two in final form were given him at the Bar Association meeting itself, and if it had occurred to the hon. minister to ask his deputy about the facts—and it seems to me that the hon. minister must take the responsibility if he did not—the answer would have been readily forthcoming.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I explained to the committee yesterday and at the risk of being tedious and repetitive I say again that Mr. Diefenbaker who after all is the only person who has ever quoted these documents, quoted a number of passages in the House and one of the passages he quoted is not in any document I have ever seen and therefore I jumped, perhaps hastily to the conclusion that the documents I had been shown were not final, because I would naturally not jump to the only other conclusion possible, namely that Mr. Diefenbaker read, as something in this document, something that was not there. Mr. Fulton can have it either way.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that now we proceed to the report of the deputy minister explaining the increase in the number of personnel of the department between 1950 and 1956 in answer to the questions put to him so long ago that I have forgotten by whom.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: By Mr. Thatcher.

The CHAIRMAN: That is fine. Have we got that answer?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Thatcher is interested in saving money.

As a matter of fact, such a length of time has gone by since this question was asked that I have had an opportunity to do a little homework. I think I can give a general explanation fairly briefly myself, as soon as members have this table. Then the members of the committee can turn to the officials for any further details they want. The reason why I feel I ought to say something about it myself is this.

Every member should have a copy before him, because I have to say something about the arithmetic, that is, the way these figures are compiled. For the fiscal year 1950-51, which was the first full year in the existence of the department—in fact the department had been in existence for only just over two months before that fiscal year began—the figures given are those taken from the main estimates for that year. I am sorry to say that they are not accurate, but I felt that if we gave any other figures it might take longer to get the story straight. Two things happened, and I want to explain both of them. Certain additional positions were included in the supplementary estimates for that year because it was a new department and had certain deficiencies. Certain additional positions were provided in the supplementary estimates in the very first year, and those should be added.

In departmental administration there were 16 more. So really the correct figure for that fiscal year is not 21, but 37.

As far as the Canadian Citizenship and the Citizenship Registration branches were concerned, there is no change.

The figure for the Immigration branch is too high. 1,801 positions were listed but, of these, 158 were actually customs officers who did immigration

work, for which the department had reimbursed the Department of National Revenue. They therefore should not be included, because it would mean duplication of personnel. That would reduce the number to 1,643. Then 11 additional position were provided in the supplementary estimates, and that would make the correct figure for the Immigration branch for the year 1,654, which is considerably less than 1,801, and makes it that much harder for me to explain the increase to Mr. Thatcher.

Then, in the case of Indian Affairs branch, there were 24 positions which should not have been listed. They were temporary school-teachers and not really employees of the department. So we should subtract 24 from that total, leaving 1,081. Then we should add 29, because there were 29 additional positions in the supplementaries, bringing the total to 1,110.

Mr. FULTON: Would it not be better to file another table with these figures?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We thought of filing it with these corrections, but I felt sure that, if we did, someone would produce the blue book for 1950-51 and say that I was trying to mislead the committee. Actually, by making these arithmetical corrections, I have created more for myself to explain than I would have had otherwise. The corrected total of personnel for 1950-51 is 2,913 instead of 3,039. The number of people for whom we are asking to have salaries voted this year is 3,954, which means that there is an increase of 1,041 in the five-year period.

Now, I do not think it is necessary again to go into an explanation of the increases in the departmental adminstration branch which we went over in some detail the other day. But I shall refer briefly to each of the other branches.

The Citizenship Registration branch during the five-year period has been decreased in size from 84 to 68. Four positions from this branch were transferred to the departmental administration—so those four are not a real decrease—to form a microfilming and duplicating section of the administration branch; and the remainder were dropped owing to a reorganization of the branch. I think that this was due to better methods of work in the branch and more efficient machinery, because the work in this branch has very markedly increased, even though it has been possible to do it with a somewhat smaller staff. It is interesting to note that during this period the number of citizenship certificates issued increased as follows, if the members would like to have this information: 19,500 in 1950; 21,000 in 1951; 20,500 in 1952; 22,500 in 1953; 27,000 in 1954. From an estimate of the number of applications which we are now receiving, there should be a very much larger number this year.

In the Immigration branch it has been necessary to increase the staff owing to increased border traffic between Canada and the United States. Someone brought this up in the House one day. It was in the debate on the address, and was not directed to me, but I happened to be there. The statement was made that if a bridge was built across the St. Lawrence to take the place of a ferry we would leave an Immigration man where the ferry had been and put a new man at the end of the bridge. I interjected to say that I thought that would rather depend on whether the ferry was stopped or not, because if the ferry and the bridge were both still there, even though the traffic did not increase very much, it might be necessary to have a man at both places. I think it will be in the knowledge of all members of the committee that there are many places along the border where the customs officers do the immigration work. Personally I rather hope that there may be more. I think that those situations should be reviewed very frequently, and I am hoping that this inspectional service, among the other things it may do, will look at

the volume of traffic in these places and see where the work can be done equally well by customs officers. There are many places where an immigrant never comes and it is purely a question of visitors going back and forth.

Mr. THATCHER: There are points like that in Saskatchewan particularly.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And there are many places in Saskatchewan where we do not have either, as Mr. Thatcher well knows. The traffic figures for 1950 show an entry of 39½ millions, as compared with 1954 when the volume of border traffic reached something over 50 millions, an increase of 10 millions in those five years. No matter how cursory the examination is, Mr. Stuart will testify that the Immigration officer has to give a brief glance at everybody going each way, or at any rate at all the incoming ones.

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): Correct.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But if you are not to hold people up, you have got to have enough people to do that and to take care of the traffic; and if we do not have enough people to take care of the traffic, I do not suppose I should say it, but you know what I was going to say.

Then we had the five-day week. The five-day week has not made any difference to the departmental administration. I said somewhat facetiously that we just worked harder. I really should not have said that. These people have always worked so hard that I do not believe they could work any harder, but it has not been necessary because of the five-day week to add to the departmental administration.

However, in the field, where people are crossing the border and so on it is perfectly obvious that the five-day week adds to the number of employees that are required.

Then, since 1950 we have instituted this assisted passage loan scheme, and it has to be administered by somebody and that requires a certain number of people.

After my predecessor became minister and the rather more aggressive immigration policy really got under way, there was a good deal more work than there ever had been before, in looking for opportunities for employment and for development of one kind and another, although Mr. Cameron does think we are very grandmotherly in the department.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): No. I said "grandfatherly".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I beg your pardon. Maybe he does think we are grandmotherly. Nevertheless, there has been increased work in the field to provide more assistance for immigrants; and I mean by assistance, assistance in finding suitable employment, in looking for farms where they can be established, and small industries and employment opportunities, and that sort of thing.

Then of course my predecessor quite deliberately, as a matter of fact, carrying out the conscious policy of the government, increased the overseas immigration service in order to cope as nearly as he could with the volume of work that there was in those offices. Perhaps, this is rather more about the immigration branch than a general explanation, but I would like to say one or two things about it.

I know that every member, or nearly every member, who has anything to do with the immigration department thinks that we are—or tends to think —that we are rather slow about dealing with some of these cases overseas. In fact, I sometimes think so myself, but I am told—I have never been to any of these offices—but I am told that conditions in our office, for example, in Rome—just to take it as an example, which is perhaps the most extreme

example—are such that there are so many applicants, and there is so much mail there, that there is hardly any room left in the office for the employees to do their work. The conditions under which they work are very bad.

Now you might say: "Why not employ a lot more people and deal with all these applications?" But there we run right up against Mr. Thatcher. We cannot employ people unless we pay them salaries and we do not want to employ people unless we can employ competent and honest people.

We have had some little doubt, as the committee knows,—I do not want to say anything about matters that are before the courts—but we have had some little doubt about the latter factor, in the case of one or two of them; and it is a matter of real concern and always will be a matter of real concern.

When people are very anxious to get into this country, and when there are some difficulties in the way, why deny it? It is obvious that human beings, being what they are, there will at times be temptations offered to people; and there will once in a while, unfortunately, be people who yield to those temptations, and I do not think that can be avoided.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, before the minister leaves that subject—and perhaps the information would have to be furnished later—could he tell us how many cases there are now before the courts arising out of these matters? I think you have two or three in Montreal, one a rather serious one.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are you referring to the habeas corpus on deportations?

Mr. FULTON: No; I am referring to employees of the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Offhand the deputy minister thinks the number is seven, but I have not got the figure right here. I think I had better go on to the explanation of why those figures have risen since 1950.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you give the increase in the numbers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In the immigration branch?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, it was 1654; the increase is exactly 400; from 1654 to 2054; that is for the whole immigration branch.

Mr. JUTRAS: How many of these are for overseas? Have you got the figures? I mean for outside of Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: 417.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Those are the ones outside of Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are 417 outside Canada. I have not listed these details. I will have to turn to the officials for that. But our staff has been expanded. In 1950 it was 135 and it has been increased. It looks as though about two-thirds of the whole increase in the immigration branch is overseas.

Mr. JUTRAS: How many of them would be settlement officers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Overseas?

Mr. JUTRAS: No, in Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if that question could stand. These figures deal with the whole department. Perhaps Mr. Jutras would be good enough to wait until we get to an item on immigration. I think perhaps it would be better to give the general explanation first. I shall have Mr. Smith make a note of your question.

The CHAIRMAN: Of the 1041, 400 are due to the increase in the immigration branch.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes; the biggest increase of course is in Indian Affairs.

Mr. GARLAND: What has the department in mind in the way of correcting the situation at the Rome office?

The CHAIRMAN: Could we not come to that later on, Mr. Garland, when we reach that item?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Now to go on with the causes of increase in the immigration branch. The increase in the immigration branch would have been larger than it has been if some of the services had not been transferred from that branch to departmental administration; the personnel branch and the statistical unit, for example. So that on a strict basis of comparabiliy the increase in deparmental administration seems large, while the increase in the immigration branch may seem small; but that is because of these transfers from one branch to the other.

Then, in Indian Affairs the increase in personnel for Indian Affairs was based on requirements for additional teachers relating almost entirely to an expansion in the educational program—not quite entirely— and the need for additional employees for Indian Estates work. I might just as well make a clean breast of it before some one asks me. The Indian estates are not in a satisfactory state, and I would feel fully justified in hiring more employees to deal with them if we could find the right kind of employees and be sure they would be dealt with more expeditiously.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not know if we should take up specific questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. Perhaps they could just be reserved. It might save a lot of time in some of these things if I admit the deficiencies right away.

The increase in the number of Indian students at day and residential schools is responsible for the large increase in the number of school teachers. This represents the main increase in the Indian Affairs branch, and almost 50 per cent of the general increase in the department. In 1950-51 we provided for the employment of 523 teachers. In 1955-56 we are providing for 1,005, an increase of 482. Some of these are theoretical employees and if any hon. member knows of anybody who is qualified to be a teacher in an Indian school and wants a job please let us know. As I said this is an increase of 482. In other words we have just about doubled the number of school teachers. I would hope that even Mr. Thatcher would not criticize that particular increase in expenditure.

Now, to give you an idea of what has happened, the enrolment in day schools in 1950 was just under 14,000; today it is over 17,000. The enrolment in residential schools in 1950 was a little over 9,000. Today it is over 11,000.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are those departmental schools, schools operated by the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, or staffed by the department.

I think that that really pretty well covers the general explanation.

Mr. NESBITT: I was wondering if I could for a moment revert to a question, also on the general administration which was referred to the other day. Yesterday Mr. Smith provided me with these forms which you fill out for immigrants coming to Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps we should now have them distributed to everybody.

Mr. NESBITT: On these forms are numerous things.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we wait until they are distributed please.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if any members of this committee wish more detail about these figures first, if you don't mind Mr. Nesbitt.

Mr. THATCHER: There is just one specific thing. It still seems to me that even with the explanations of the minister that departmental administration has gone up very very rapidly. I would like to be specific. Looking at these personnel officers again who we were speaking of last meeting, there are 11

new personnel officers under departmental administration who did not appear a year ago. Were they in some other department a year ago?

Mr. FORTIER: About a year ago there were some in the Indian Affairs branch.

Mr. THATCHER: How many?

Mr. FORTIER: I gave that information the other day. I forget it now.

Mr. THATCHER: I do not think you did. It now appears on page 142. You did not mention any for last year and there are 11 for this year.

Mr. FORTIER: There were 28 last year in the estimates book.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And 39 this year.

Mr. THATCHER: On page 142, half way down the page, you show 11 personnel officers for 1955-56. You show them as 1, 2 and 8 and do not show any for a year ago. This is general departmental administration. There are none listed for a year ago and I was wondering if they have been transferred from another department.

Mr. FORTIER: They must have been listed last year under administration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have last year's book here.

Mr. BYRNE: Would not 3 of them have been information officers last year?

Mr. FORTIER: I do not think so.

Mr. THATCHER: Perhaps I can proceed and you can get the details later.

The CHAIRMAN: They are looking it up now and possibly can give you the answer right away.

Mr. W. J. BRENNAN: I cannot give you the exact figures, but this year in the estimates the detail shows the reclassification of certain persons. There were possibly head clerks, principal clerks, or grade fours, who have now been classified as personnel officers so that the 11 personnel officer positions are not 11 new positions but simply reclassifications. You may find a reduction in head clerks or principal clerks or grade fours.

Mr. THATCHER: There could hardly be enough under departmental administration because your other staff has gone up so substantially.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. THATCHER: Would you, Mr. Chairman, entertain a motion? In view of the fact that there are so many personnel officers and they are handling such a small turnover of staff which I think is less than 10 per cent which would be 400 people a year at the outside that these personnel officers would be handling, I would move—and I think Mr. Cameron will second the motion—that these personnel officers be reduced from 11 to 3.

In support of what I have said, Mr. Chairman, I will say that I worked at a pretty big plant. They had two personnel officers handling a staff of 2,000. I do not know of any company in Canada that would have so many personnel officers handling such a small turnover of staff. I think that some saving in staff could be made on that particular item and I would therefore make that as a motion.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have no objection to Mr. Thatcher making the motion although of course I will vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thatcher, will you write your motion out so the clerk may be sure he has it as you want it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was going to say that it seems to me that before the committee is asked to vote on a motion like this that you might accept the suggestion I made that we ask Mr. Abbott who is in charge of the personnel division to come and tell us what all these people do. I can assure the committee right now that if I can be convinced that they are not all doing a job that is

worth doing I will be very glad to consider any reduction that we can make. I certainly do not want anybody in this department who has nothing to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you put your motion in writing, Mr. Thatcher?

Mr. THATCHER: I will hold it until this gentleman whom the minister mentions comes here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We could have him here tomorrow.

Mr. THATCHER: I have to go west tonight.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: One duty of our personnel officers is to insist on attendance of the staff.

Mr. THATCHER: It is pressure of public business.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I think it would be rather too bad not to have Mr. Thatcher here. Suppose we leave it to our meeting on Monday. Mr. Thatcher and I will both be very tired after going out west on public business.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we can have the personnel officer here on Monday.

Mr. HELLYER: I see here an item for clerks grades I and II-A. Are these male employees?

Mr. FORTIER: They could be male or they could be female.

Mr. HELLYER: Would they be mature people?

Mr. FORTIER: They would be over 18 and under 65.

Mr. HELLYER: My question relates to salaries. I have worked them out here, and they could be as low as $28 a week. For grade I they are as low as $35 a week—I see they are as low as $28 a week for grade I. They are as low as $35 a week for grade II-A. How in heaven's name can people exist on salaries of that order?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are only two people shown here. Are they messengers? I have not the foggiest idea.

Mr. HELLYER: There are 10 of them in that second category.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is category II-A. I would imagine myself that this would refer to unmarried women who have just come into the service.

Mr. MONTEITH: Perhaps just out of school.

Mr. HELLYER: I wonder if we could possibly find out about that. If they were efficient they would be badly underpaid, and if they were not competent it might be advisable to reduce their number and employ a smaller number of more competent people at larger salaries.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Probably the Commission have a policy about this under which they hire people and the department has nothing to say about it. They are recruited by the Civil Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We certainly should provide the information. There is one point which needs explanation, and one which will arise in the case of every department. The way the Civil Service Commission operates, I understand is this: we say we have a job to do and the Civil Service Commission comes along and decides what category of person is necessary to do that job. We can argue with that decision and do our best, but they are the ones who decide how important the job is and what kind of person should do it among their various Civil Service categories, and then they recruit somebody for us. If the person turns up and looks hopeless, which does not often happen, we can say "No" and that is really about all we can do.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the position which is open is, let us say, grade III and you have someone in grade II-B capable of doing the work, would that person be moved automatically into the higher position?

Mr. FORTIER: That would go by competition.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Even if this person were on the staff?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The person on the staff can enter the competition.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It may interest the committee to know that I visited five of the Immigration centres in Europe in the last six months. In the case of Rome, for example, I understand they process about 3,000 people per month. They interview and medically examine them but don't actually give them their ticket for Canada. We get about 30,000 of them a year. I found the quarters far too small to deal with the numbers involved. The quarters were very clean; but they were investigation services, medical services and other officers of the department to be accommodated and the building was crowded with people standing three and four deep in the corridors. They were working under difficult conditions.

In Paris the quarters were almost luxurious, perhaps too big, but that is not the fault of our government; but the French for reasons of policy want their people to stay in France.

In London the quarters were new and good. The officials were extremely polite and courteous.

In Amsterdam I was told by officials of the Dutch government that our relations with that country were extremely good. I understand 25,000 Dutch people come over here each year.

In Berne, Switzerland, the quarters were small but they were efficient and the Swiss had no worries.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am gratified to hear this. We do not always hear that kind of report. The minister tends only to hear complaints against the administration.

Mr. NESBITT: Since everybody has these forms now, it would save time if I referred to them. There are three forms. One is the Immigration form OS-8. The other is OS-8-A, the yellow one, and the third is the printed examination card which I understand people who are applying to enter Canada have to fill out in addition to the others. I see that on the Canadian Immigration card, the white one, item 22 is "ethnic origin", and item 22 is "religion" and that on OS-8, the white form, the application for admission to Canada, it says that item 8 is "ethnic origin" and item 9 "religion." Item 10 sex. Form OS-8-A, item 4 is citizenship; item 5 religion; item 6 is the number of accompanying dependents, and so on. The other day—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact I want to apologize to the Committee. I misled the Committee, and I did it quite accidentally. Perhaps I should have examined these forms myself beforehand, but I have only examined them once and that was when I was examining the form or a photostat of the form, of a certain gentleman Mrs. Fairclough is interested in. What I should have said is that we do not tabulate this information and keep it as a statistic.

Mr. NESBITT: In other words these cards remain with the department. The information is there, but it is not tabulated.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. I feel I owe the committee an apology.

Mr. NESBITT: Why is the information collected if it is not tabulated?

Mr. SMITH: It is used to determine where a man should be placed on arrival in Canada. We must know because some employers are insistent on getting employees of their own persuasion or faith.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are you suggesting there are any parts of Canada to which it would not be possible to send, say, a Roman Catholic or a Baptist?

Mr. SMITH: We could send them to any area, but there are certain employers who have requested that their employees should have certain specific training or religious beliefs.

Mr. FULTON: What category of employees would this apply to?

Mr. SMITH: To people such as farm labourers and domestics who are required to live in the homes. This is never required when an employer is recruiting men in large numbers. But there are cases from time to time where an employer wants an employee to live in the home, and then sometimes religion is specified.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that these forms that have been filed would be of interest to those who may be following our proceedings, particularly our colleagues in the House. It does not seem as if it would be a great problem to print them in the appendix, and I think it might be well to have them there for reference. Would you like to consider that?

Mr. FULTON: Could the printing bureau handle this?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They made them in the first place. I think that they probably could.

Mr. MONTEITH: You would have to get them down to size.

Mr. HELLYER: It would be quite a job to fit them into the size of the records.

The CHAIRMAN: They would not be in this form, but only the information that is in them would be given. What is your wish?

Mr. THATCHER: I think it would be a waste of money. If anybody wanted to have them they could get them from the department.

Mr. BYRNE: I am inclined to agree with Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. NESBITT: Unless there are questions asked about them.

Mr. MONTEITH: Let us leave it until another meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask you to consider the matter and let me know your wishes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There has been a reference in the proceedings of today to these forms, and Mr. Nesbitt quoted the numbers of each one. So there will be an indication of what is being discussed.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Nesbitt simply wants to show that it is there and we are all agreed that it is there.

The CHAIRMAN: So far there has been no question asked that would necessitate printing them, but other questions may be asked.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the final resting place of the forms regarding each immigrant who comes here? Where are they filed?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director had better answer that question.

Mr. SMITH: Form 1000 is filed in at the port of entry, then sent to Ottawa where it is microfilmed. It is kept for a certain period and then it is destroyed, as the information is on the microfilm.

Mr. CANNON: What is the period?

Mr. SMITH: The actual form is kept for one year. Then we can go to the microfilm.

Mr. CANNON: What about the O.S. 8?

Mr. SMITH: The O.S. 8 is filled and filed with the overseas office. When there is an O.S. 8 (a) completed, as it is in cases of open placement, the information accompanies the immigrant to his final placement in Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the age of these forms in their present wording?

Mr. SMITH: In their present wording? There was an amendment to Form 1000 in 1952.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The printing bureau indicates the date: "Revised 1.4.53". In April, 1953.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is other information on these forms tabulated?

Mr. SMITH: The only ones tabulated are the forms 1000.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): All the information contained on the Form 1000?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. Religion, for one, is not.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What is the objection to tabulating the religion?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That objection that I made the other day. Perhaps you would look at what I said.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I remember what you said, but it seems to me that, if anything, the result of the tabulation would set at rest the questions to which you were referring.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a matter of judgment. As Mr. Thatcher would say, it would cost more money to do it. Up to now it has been the judgment of the government that, apart from everything else, it would not be worth what it cost. Unless I hear some very strong arguments to the contrary, I would persist in that view.

The CHAIRMAN: There is one point we should consider before we adjourn. As you have already been informed, the minister cannot be here on Friday. I was wondering what the attitude of the committee would be to our meeting for half an hour or an hour on Friday, perhaps at 11 o'clock, to indicate to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and his deputy, if they could be here, some of the over-all information that we might want them to prepare for us. If there happened to be anything in the nature of what we asked from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration with regard to explaining an increase in the over-all personnel of the department over a period of years or something of that sort, we might give them notice of that and they could be preparing it while we were finishing with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. If the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources could be here with his deputy for an hour or even half an hour, the members could give them an idea of the kind of information they intended to ask for and they could get it ready. Do the members think that such a meeting would be worth while?

Mr. FULTON: That would put us in a rather awkward position, because our work on this committee is so organized that we will be changing our personnel as each department comes forward. I personally would not feel free to speak for a colleague in my party who wishes to deal with that particular work. It would thus mean two motions for a complete change in our personnel on the committee just for a half-hour meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: What I had in mind was this: if any member had in mind a question requiring an answer that might take some time to prepare, he could give us some idea of it and the departmental officials could commence work on it. I do not know if members think that this would be worth while.

Mr. HELLYER: I suggest that they could do that unofficially through you, by giving you notice in writing of anything of that nature.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a good idea. If any of the members have questions to which they think it will take some time to prepare answers, will they give

me some idea of them and I will pass them on to the minister. That will save us meeting on Friday.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Before we adjourn, does the committee anticipate that the whole of tomorrow's session will be required on the Immigration branch, or would they like to have some Citizenship officers present? I should like to finish with Immigration before we commence Citizenship, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN: If your official does not mind being here tomorrow, it might be as well to have him present.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are two. There are two Citizenship branches.

The CHAIRMAN: We could have one here just in case.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: One deals with Canadian Citizenship and the other with Citizenship Registration.

Mr. FULTON: One of our members is anxious to be here when the National Gallery is dealt with. When we have finished with Immigration would you consider calling the National Gallery as the next item? It is purely a matter of convenience. I am just making the request because the member will have to be away about the middle of next week.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that I could undertake to do it on Monday, because I have some preparatory work to do. The Director of the National Gallery is on the point of retiring, and a new director has been appointed and the gallery is in a period of transition.

Mr. FULTON: I had intended to discuss that privately with the chairman and the Minister.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If it were the wish of the committee, I would like to accommodate anybody who is especially interested. As a matter of fact, I would be very glad to find some members of parliament who really were interested in the National Gallery. And if it were the wish of the committee I think I would be prepared to bring it up on Tuesday. I have already made an engagement for Mr. Thatcher with the personnel officer on Monday, and I was hoping—as I would probably be very tired—that he would do all the work.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister tells me that he can be here from 10.30 to 12.30 tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apparently there is to be no cabinet meeting, so the contingency I was afraid of will not arise.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we adjourn now until 10.30?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is there any preference as between the citizenship branch and the citizenship registration branch?

Mr. BYRNE: We are still on departmental administration, are we not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. The members will note the written notices of meeting say 10.00 o'clock but the meeting will commence at 10.30 and it will be held tomorrow morning in this room.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Has the minister yet got the answer to the question I asked as to who the authorities are who do the screening in Europe?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I have not, and I do not anticipate having it before next week.

The committee adjourned.

Positions listed in the Estimates tabled in the House of Commons for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration

	Fiscal Year 1950-51	Fiscal Year 1955-56
Departmental Administration	21	134
Canadian Citizenship	28	46
Citizenship Registration	84	68
Immigration	1,801	2,054
Indian Affairs	1,105	1,652
Totals	3,039	3,954

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament
1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 6

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration, and Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 3, 1955.
(7)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickle Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Pickersgill, Starr, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel, and Mr. J. E. Duggan, Registrar.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Copies of an "Occupational Selection List" were distributed, the Minister and his officials being questioned thereon.

Item number 67 was adopted.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Monday, March 7.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

54504—1½

EVIDENCE

THURSDAY, March 3, 1955.
10.30 A.M.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. I see a quorum so we will commence.

Mr. Pickersgill will introduce the officials of his department who are here for the first time and say a word about the proceedings.

Hon. John W. PICKERSGILL (*Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*): Mr. J. K. Abbott is the chief of the personnel division, and as Mr. Hellyer asked some questions yesterday which no one knew the answer to I thought we had better have Mr. Abbott here this morning so that he could provide information on any of these personnel questions.

I also asked Mr. J. E. Duggan, who is head of the Citizenship branch, to come along in case we make good progress and dispose of the immigration branch this morning and wish to start on the Citizenship registration branch.

I think that I should also inform the committee that the only other engagement I have outside of Ottawa until the 1st of April is on Wednesday of next week. I did not mention that earlier because I rather expected that the committee would have been finished with me long before that. In case they are not I think I perhaps ought to serve notice of that engagement now.

Subject to the reservation of any particular point on which we are not able to provide information now, and also subject to the reservation that until Mr. Thatcher is able to return for an examination of the personnel division, I wondered whether it might be agreeable to the committee now to start with one branch and dispose of it and go on to the next branch, because it seems to me that, unless we proceed in some orderly fashion like that, it is going to be very hard to give the kind of information which the members of the committee want. I am not seeking in any way to impose my wishes on the committee, but it does occur to me that a consecutive and orderly procedure might facilitate the work of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the way we might do that would be to take the items and perhaps leave the departmental administration item, 59, to the last. In that way if there is anything left over it could be brought up when we finally carried 59.

Before I come to that there is the question that I thought we might discuss at the start instead of at the end of the sitting, because some of the members sometimes leave a few minutes before the end of the meeting, and that is our program for next week. We will not be sitting tomorrow because the minister is going to be away, and I think every member of the committee is conscious of the fact that there is a tremendous amount of committee work for committees in which they are interested looming up and that work is going to start very shortly. I think that every member here would like to do a real good job on this estimates committee. Personally, I would like to contemplate sitting twice on Monday and Tuesday because we will not be able to sit on Wednesday, and twice on Thursday and perhaps once on Friday.

Mr. MICHENER: We, of course, have other obligations.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Can we not sit on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, once or twice?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am afraid that I cannot be at the disposal of the committee on Wednesday. I have an engagement in London which I made last September and it would be a grave discourtesy for me to break that engagement.

Mr. FULTON: Are we to sit on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday of next week?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. We can sit in the mornings on those days. Mr. Michener was stating that there were other obligations, but what I have in mind is when the other committees really get going everybody knows how busy we will be. This is an extra committee. I think that when all the other committees get going we will have difficulty. The desire also is to get these estimates back so that they may be considered in the House as soon as is reasonably possible.

Now, I am in the hands of the committee in this matter. I feel that the committee wants to have plenty of time to go into all these matters and we do no want to feel pressed for time. If we do not sit next week twice a day, at least on some of the days of the week, when especially we cannot meet on Wednesday, we will not make the progress which in my opinion we should make.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, this is a very important committee and, as I understand it, based on a clear recollection of what was said in the rules committee and the House, this is to some extent an experiment this year and I think it would be a shame if the experiment were to be placed in any jeopardy whatsoever by setting for ourselves a schedule that we simply could not keep. I do suggest very earnestly that to try to sit twice a day for two or three days a week and once a day for the other days is setting a schedule which we will not be able to keep and a schedule under which we would not do justice to the work. While we must not try to be deliberately slow I think that to sit once a day and to even occasionally meet on Wednesday once a day for a good two hours is more than most other committees do especially at this stage of the session and is about all we can really tackle so that from day to day we are able to keep abreast of what happened that day and to keep abreast of the answers filed that day and can go on the next day having digested in a sensible manner what went on the day before. I feel that by sitting twice a day the members will not be able to do justice to the work of the committee. While it is an experimental committee it is also an important committee and I do not think we should approach our work in the manner of rushing it through. We are always faced, I think, with the problem of manning the various committees of the House, but I do not feel that there is any committee more important than this which is really experimental this year and we have to try to make it work. I do not think that we should jeopardize our experiment by setting a schedule which we cannot keep or which if we do keep would not do justice to the work before us.

Mr. BYRNE: I do not like to see anyone overworked; but on the other hand, I do not think that it is casting any reflections on the importance of this committee if we indicate our desire to try to get on with it as rapidly as possible. The reason why other committees do not sit more than once a day in the early stages of the session is that they have nothing to deal with. We have an immense amount of work to deal with, and I think that we should at least attempt to sit twice a day on two days of the week. I think it would be an excellent opportunity to keep such members as Mr. Dufresne out of trouble; it would be something to do. I think we should try to sit as often as possible.

Mr. NESBITT: This committee is a new experiment, and the first department to have its estimates before the committee is the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. It has been pointed out that for various reasons the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration have not been gone into perhaps as thoroughly as those of some of the other departments in previous years. I will not say "thoroughly"; a better word may be "completely". There have been also certain sideroads of contention so to speak,

such as we have been hearing in the last few days. It seems to me that we should give our present method a further try before it is decided to meet twice a day. Possibly the work of the committee on this particular department may now go on much more rapidly than before. It has been so slow up to now, probably, because its estimates have not been looked into for some time; there have been a number of contentious matters; and it is a department in which there is a good deal of public interest. Some of the other departments before this committee, such as Northern Affairs and National Resources, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, will not be found as contentious as this one. We might continue for a day or so before we make definite plans. Then if we are still going too slowly, possibly your plan might be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought that we might make up our minds now as to how we will compensate for the Friday and Wednesday we are going to lose. In other words, I was suggesting that sometime next week we sit twice a day to make up for those days we are losing, so that in the net result we would get in at least five sittings each week. I think we should do that anyway for next week. I have mentioned that now, and I have the opinion of the members of the committee. On Monday we can see whether it is going to throw anybody out very much if we sit on, say, Monday afternoon or Tuesday afternoon to make up for Friday, and perhaps we could sit on Thursday afternoon or Friday afternoon to make up for Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not want to interpose any further difficulties in the committee, but this morning I forgot to look at the schedule for my return from London on Thursday morning. I will get here sometime on Thursday morning, but I do not know whether it is as early as 10.30. Perhaps somebody who habitually flies from London knows that.

Mr. NESBITT: There is one plane that leaves London at about six in the morning.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That would not bother me at all, if that were the only obstacle.

Mr. GARLAND: I believe that it gets in at about 10.25 in the morning.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will do my utmost to get here, but I cannot fly faster than T.C.A.

The CHAIRMAN: We will leave that till Monday morning.

Mr. FULTON: In fairness, if you were seeking to sound out the feelings of the committee now and perhaps contemplating that on Monday there would be an agreement to sit on, say, two afternoons or maybe more, I should say this: that would mean sitting on two afternoons a week while the House is sitting and as we see it now, we would certainly request very strongly that that procedure be not followed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is another point which I should like to clear up. Mr. Fulton suggested that there was a member of the House who was going to be away—a member of the committee, I would assume—after the middle of next week, and who was particularly anxious to be here when we gave some consideration to the National Gallery estimates. I would be quite prepared to have the National Gallery officials come on Tuesday, but not Monday. I have not time to be ready myself for Monday. I do not know what is the wish of the committee.

Mr. FULTON: I had intended to discuss that with yourself and the chairman rather than bring it up as an issue at the moment, because other things may intervene. If it were convenient—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It will be convenient for me to know whether that is likely to happen, because I also have a certain amount of work to do.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, is it not customary to have a steering committee to decide on these questions, so that it would not be necessary to use up 20 minutes or half an hour of the committee's time?

The CHAIRMAN: The reason why no steering committee was set up is that the only thing a steering committee would have to do would be to decide the time of sittings. If the committee thinks that it would save time, we could have a steering committee.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Why do we not leave it to the chairman to fix the time?

Mr. BYRNE: At all times then.

The CHAIRMAN: I will talk to some of the members of the committee between now and Monday and, having in mind the program for the week in the House, I shall try to figure some arrangement out and bring it before you on Monday.

The minister has suggested that we take some specific items now—and I think that would probably be a good way—with the understanding that by leaving item 59 open we can always take up anything that has to stand.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We go right down to Immigration and take item 66.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 66. Administration of the Immigration Act.

Mr. STARR: The other day I asked a very broad question on the procedure regarding an immigrant. I should like to have an explanation as to what happens at the port of entry in Canada. Is the Department of Citizenship and Immigration alone in its reception activity, or is there any assistance from any groups of people or organizations who help in that type of reception?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is a proper question on item 66. Would Mr. Smith address himself to Mr. Starr's question?

The CHAIRMAN: You may either sit or stand, as you wish.

Mr. C. E. S. SMITH (*Director of Immigration*): On arrival they are met first by our medical advisers. Then the Immigration officers question them and check their documents. From there they are assisted by our settlement service, which determines those for open placement and their distination and makes arrangements for notifying the inland officers of their arrival. We are also assisted at the port of arrival by voluntary agencies, particularly the Red Cross and the Traveller's Aid. Then there are the chaplain services from the various church groups, who interrogate them and endeavour to find those who may become members of their churches throughout Canada. We also have representatives of the railroads, who meet groups that may be destined to them. We have also the Department of Labour officials, who look after those who are destined to the Department of Labour.

Mr. STARR: There were two seminars held, one at Lake Couchiching and one at the Guild of all Arts, a few years ago, and at that time the opinion was expressed that there was a lack of cooperation between the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and these private agencies who were endeavouring to cooperate. Do you know that?

Mr. LAVAL FORTIER (*Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*): If I remember correctly, Mr. Starr, the seminar at Scarborough raised a question concerning the port of Halifax and they asked us to investigate that with the voluntary agencies. That has been done.

Mr. STARR: In other words, there was cooperation at other ports with the exception of Halifax?

Mr. FORTIER: Also in Halifax, but it was not so well known.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I might say a brief word on that. While in Halifax for a different purpose, I happened to have the good fortune to be there on the day when an immigrant ship came in. I was very glad of the chance of seeing

just how these people were treated, and from my observation it did seem to me—this was an Italian ship and a great proportion of these people could speak very little English—that they were treated there with great consideration. I walked around and looked at their faces more than anything else. Many of them looked quite bewildered, I admit, but everyone that I could see seemed to be quite kind and patient with them and there was no confusion of any description that I could discern. I was very pleased with what I saw.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if the appropriate officer would follow the course of the immigrants from the seaport? I am particularly interested in the procedure at Toronto and the facilities in the station. If possible, I would like you to take the immigrant from his reception there to the time when he is placed in a job, with particular reference to the relationship between the Department of Labour and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. I have heard disquieting rumors, which I should like the department to deal with here as far as possible, that there is something to be desired in the cooperation between the two departments in looking after the immigrants in that reception.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that Mr. Smith might speak about that, too.

Mr. SMITH: As I described, the officers in Halifax notify the inland officers of the arrival of certain groups. There may be some that come individually, where we do not have officers meet them at their destination; they are met by the sponsors or, on the other hand, if they are unsponsored, they are met by the Traveller's Aid, who immediately get into touch with our officials if necessary. We will take Toronto, for example. We have our officers there when called. The Traveller's Aid looks after them and directs them to our offices in conjunction with the officer or officers that we may have assigned to that particular movement.

Mr. MICHENER: Is an officer on duty all the time in the station?

Mr. SMITH: Not in the station. He is called on receipt of information from the port of arrival. It is then decided at what time the officers should be there and how many. The immigrants are then sent from there to our office in Church street, Toronto, where their O.S.8(a) forms, which I mentioned yesterday, are checked against their statement to find out their qualifications. They are then put in touch with the employer with whom we have developed an opportunity. Of course, the sponsored cases may not be met by our officers, as we endeavour to notify sponsors of the arrival of their dependents, but nine times out of ten the sponsored cases themselves notify their relatives in advance.

Mr. MICHENER: I am more interested in the other cases—what you call "open placement".

Mr. SMITH: Open placement. At the office we also endeavour to obtain suitable temporary accommodation for the worker and, if he is accompanied by his family, for them likewise.

Mr. MICHENER: At the Church street office?

Mr. SMITH: At the Church street office.

Mr. MICHENER: Will you tell me how many employees there are at the Church street office?

Mr. SMITH: 79, as of June 30.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the total for Toronto?

Mr. SMITH: That is the total for Toronto. That includes clerks and stenographic help, and inspectors who may be called upon to examine planes at Malton.

Mr. MICHENER: Then you have them—

Mr. SMITH: We have them in our office. Then we put them in touch with the prospective employer. The prospective employer may not have indicated on that particular day that he needs a person, but we have several employers listed. Then, Toronto being the headquarters of a district, we also have information funneling to them from throughout the province of Ontario as a whole. Therefore, if there is no opportunity in that particular area, we will know if there are other areas where an opportunity is available for a man with a particular type of qualification.

Now, with respect to the differences between the Labour and Immigration departments, Labour has certain open placement groups destined to it. They are met at the port of arrival and if there is a large bulk movement they will proceed directly to the employment which has been made available for them. Domestics are handled by the Department of Labour and are routed from the port of arrival to a reception centre at St. Paul l'Ermite, just north of Montreal. From there they are sent by Labour to their final destination where the work awaits them. There is no duplication of work, as the Immigration department is endeavouring to develop a greater number of opportunities in the rural areas than the Department of Labour. Where Labour gets orders from the employers for certain numbers or groups of workers that may be needed in that particular field, Immigration is endeavouring to develop, as I say, a greater number of opportunities in the rural areas. For example, there are many services needed in small towns or villages where the owner or a person running a particular business has gone to the city, and we are trying to replace such a service or business. We do not go into the large industries and ask them what the opportunities may be; that is a Labour department business. Many employers do come to us and ask if we can get immigrants with a particular qualification and of a particular type. They say that they have not been able to get them in Canada, and they have not applied to the Department of Labour. We accept their application for such labour and check with the Labour department.

Mr. MICHENER: That follows the case through the normal procedure. At this particular time, when there are not many opportunities for work available —in fact, when there are a good many unemployed in Toronto—what happens to the immigrant who cannot be placed through your Church street office and has gone to the National Employment Service and cannot find anything there? What happens to him in the intervening days until he does find some work?

Mr. SMITH: There are no open placement cases coming through in the winter months. Open placement cases were shut off this year as of September 30 and other years as of October 31. There are no open placement cases coming, but you will find some who have come no doubt in September who were placed on arrival in temporary employment and others with employers who could not retain their services. These may require financial assistance, if stranded and their resources run out. We provide emergency service in the way of paying his rent and providing food for him until employment is found.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: For one year.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the fund provided for here, $500,000?

Mr. SMITH: That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there any reception centre or hostel run by the department in the Toronto area where immigrants, particularly the single men, are given accommodation while they are seeking employment?

Mr. SMITH: No, Mr. Michener, there is no hostel in the Toronto area. We do refer them to the Salvation Army hostels there and if, as I said, they are indigent we take care of them and our staff concentrate on seeing that they get employment as soon as possible.

Mr. STARR: As an explanation of that, for the whole Toronto area there was an establishment at Ajax which has been discontinued now. The point which

I wish to bring up is this: the government is responsible for an immigrant for a period of one year after his entry in Canada, that is in financial or other assistance, and I think that that is where the difficulty arises because he may be on temporary work of some kind for that period of time and then get laid off and has not accumulated sufficient time for unemployment insurance. We have found in some municipalities a few years ago that they were a burden to the taxpayers of that municipality because even the provincial government would not participate in relief and the municipality always had to bear the brunt of financial assistance for these people and their families. I think that in order to take this onus off the municipalities some consideration should be given to the extension of that one year period. I do know that in the district branch in Toronto they were willing to send a man down to interview these people but subsequently because of the lapse of one year they felt that they could not participate in assistance.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is a question of policy. The officials cannot possibly do anything about it; neither can I. This is something that the government would have to change its policy on and decide that immigrants, unlike Canadian citizens, should be given unemployment relief by the federal government. That is really what you are asking.

Mr. STARR: The municipalities should be reimbursed because it is unfair for them to have to do it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not expressing any final view of the government but I express again the fear I would have that if the federal government undertook that responsibility for more than a year—I think it is perfectly reasonable for a year—but, when all is said and done these people who are getting employment in the community are contributing to the wealth and taxes and development of that community and if they become unemployed after one year in the country, it seems to me they should be on the same kind of basis as anyone else. It may be that a year is too short, maybe it should be for 16 months or 18 months, but I would think it would be a very grave departure for us to say that an immigrant is going to be given unemployment relief or unemployment assistance by the federal government and that Canadian citizens are not. That is really—if you extend this beyond the preliminary period—what you are saying. I think we ought to face the question squarely. But I do not know that there is very much point in our discussing it here. We do not provide for it in the etimates. It is contrary to the present policy of the government to do it.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: On the same point, may I ask Mr. Smith this: in the Montreal area how do you provide for immigrants who are out of work within the one year limit?

Mr. SMITH: Exactly the same way as in Toronto. We have in Montreal an advantage over Toronto in the form of having a home there that accommodates those that are indigent.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What is the name of the home?

Mr. SMITH: The Saint Antoine detention quarters.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think detention is a most unfortunate term. It goes back to the old days when nothing was done for the immigrant at all unless he got into trouble. Our whole approach is different nowadays, and I would be very glad under the circumstances to see some of these names changed.

Mr. STARR: I do not wish to argue the contention of the minister as to the policy of the government in respect to these immigrants. However, if the onus is relinquished by one government then it falls upon another, and I think the municipalities are an innocent government in this case because it is the

federal government who is responsible for immigration. Why should the taxpayers of a municipality be burdened with this responsibility?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should not say this, but it has always been recognized by all federal governments since confederation that the primary responsibility for the relief of indigent persons is with the local authorities and then the provincial government, and it seems to me that this question ought to be addressed to the government in Toronto.

Mr. NESBITT: This is a question along the same lines but going back a step or two further in the journey so to speak. During the recent debate in the House on immigration I mentioned a matter regarding the conditions for immigrants on the ship the *Beaver Brae*. I found later that it happened something over four years ago, but I was wondering at the present time does the department have any of their inspectors check on conditions on these ships which are bringing people to Canada?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Nesbitt. Every year we send special investigating officers down to the ports and they go from one end of the ship to the other to see that it is complying with our requirements as laid down in the Act, not from the standpoint of nautical terms, but from an immigration standpoint to see that these ships are satisfactory for the carrying of immigrants.

Mr. NESBITT: The reason why I brought this point up again at this time is because after my remarks about the *Beaver Brae* I received some letters confirming them. It was, of course, a few years ago, but I did receive several letters, not quite as severe, but describing pretty disagreeable conditions on ships as late as last fall. I do not want to go into individual cases but concerning one line, particularly the Arosa Line, I received a letter which I have here regarding pretty disagreeable conditions, where people paid for one type of passage and were forced to take other accommodation after getting on the boat, and other similar things. I know that these possibly are exceptional cases rather than the rule, but in view of the fact that apparently there are some unsatisfactory cases I wonder if the inspection service might possibly be tuned up.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: On this question of the Arosa, if there is anything disagreeable to be said I would like to have it said.

Mr. SMITH: We have inspected that line's ships on two occasions, the Arosa Star and the Arosa Kulm. We investigated those two ships last year and found nothing that was really out of order. There were small things which were brought to the owner's attention and which were rectified in the next voyages. In so far as changing accommodation is concerned, I am afraid that the Immigration department has no responsibility nor can we do anything about it. We go after them and tell them we have received these complaints that the immigrants do not seem to be getting the accommodation for which they have paid. That is a matter for the North Atlantic Conference who set certain prices in accordance with the standards provided.

Mr. NESBITT: I realize that it is very difficult for the department to control these steamship companies because they are outside, in many cases, the jurisdiction of this country, but by means of moral persuasion you might be able to persuade them a little bit.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask the proportion among the immigrants of last year of open placement immigrants to those who were sponsored? Could I have a little more information about the time of year that the bulk of last year's immigrants arrived, because I have some question I wish to base on that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have a table showing arrivals during each month in 1954. I think that the number of open placements was about 30 to 40 per cent of the total.

Mr. MICHENER: About 65,000 last year, or 70,000?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: About 60,000 to 65,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Are they spread pretty uniformly over the country?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: It seems to be in Ontario where about half the immigrants are located which is about 85,000 and Toronto would receive about half the Ontario immigrants.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: For the Toronto metropolitan area I do not think we have any figures which we could be sure of, but I have stuck my neck out in public and said that I thought that about one-fifth of all the immigrants for the whole of Canada settled in the Toronto area and that that figure was probably low. So I am not disagreeing with you.

Mr. MICHENER: A quarter or a fifth?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Somewhere between a quarter and a fifth.

Mr. MICHENER: Somewhere between 40,000 immigrants a year and if 40 per cent of those are open placement you have about 15,000 open placement to be dealt with in this method we are discussing which is a pretty sizable number of men to look after when there is unemployment. There are a lot of applicants for jobs among the natives—if I may call them that—in addition to the immigrants and my feeling is that the immigrants in not knowing the language and not having any friends are inclined to be shuffled back and forth between the Church Street office in Toronto for example, and the National Employment Service office, and between the two they can get pretty confused and get a pretty poor deal from the agencies that are intended to help them. It is a question of whether we are doing enough to look after—particularly at this time—those men. I appreciate what Mr. Smith says that they are not supposed to come after September; they come sometime during the year, and up to the 16th August, particularly in this year, it has not been easy to place them and keep them placed.

Mr. SMITH: It has not been easy to place them as in the past, but we have not experienced too much difficulty. As of February 18 in Toronto, we were providing emergency assistance to 134.

Mr. MICHENER: Only 134?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And that would include dependents.

Mr. SMITH: That includes all souls. That has come down recently. I have seen the figures—I do not have them here—where in Toronto we were providing at one time over 200 cases with financial assistance. We are able to work these people into employment continually. For instance, in the last week of February 18 we had placed 8 of those persons who were receiving full assistance, and we are able to work them off from time to time.

Mr. MICHENER: What was the maximum number receiving assistance?

Mr. SMITH: I do not have the figures, but I recall seeing them and they were slightly over 200 at one time.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that assistance pretty readily granted on application?

Mr. SMITH: When it is established that the person must have assistance.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What is the figure for Montreal?

Mr. SMITH: It is a little different. We have this hostel.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe Mr. Macnaughton is asking the number receiving relief in Montreal.

Mr. SMITH: In that week there were none in the Montreal hall. When I say there were none, there were 13 in detention who were there irrespective of whether there was an unemployment situation.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Were there some funds available?

Mr. SMITH: Yes. The same applies throughout Canada. I can give you the figures here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I take it that the committee would be interested in having the figure for the whole of Canada of the number of people in that week who were receiving assistance.

Mr. SMITH: We were granting assistance in the whole of Canada in the week of February 18 to 339.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That does not include a few whom we were detaining.

Mr. HELLYER: Would Mr. Smith tell us if there are some immigrants who do not apply for assistance for fear that it might react against them later and cause their deportation or something like that?

Mr. SMITH: There may be a few but if there are they are unbeknown to us. I cannot answer that question truthfully because I do not know, but I suspect there are some who have not come to us.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that there would be many because I believe it is the policy of the department at the offices abroad that when prospective immigrants approach them they are told about this. It may not always sink in, but I understand that it is the policy to tell every open placement immigrant; possibly the sponsored ones as well; but certainly the open placement ones. That is the policy.

Mr. GARLAND: I wish to pursue this matter of open placements a bit further. The other day Mr. Smith commented on the opportunities that may be available for the open placements. Those of us who come from places other than Toronto and Montreal—and there are some of us—very often hear the criticism that your department and the Department of Labour are primarily putting these people into Montreal and Toronto. I am wondering if you would care to comment on the attitude your department takes on the placement of these people. Is it where the greatest opportunity presents itself for he immigrant, or how do you associate that with the real need which may exist for a particular type of help throughout the country?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Are there zones or clearing points other than Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. SMITH: We send them throughout Ontario where we have what we call approved ports. We have Windsor, which we have not been using lately, because we consider there is no opportunity there due to the recent strike. In northern Ontario we haven't any points of destination.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Do you not think that you should have?

Mr. SMITH: We have offices there but no opportunities have been developed on account of the conditions which existed during the period of the strike and we are very careful. There are distributing places throughout Ontario, Sudbury for example, Kirkland Lake. We have offices in Kingston, Cornwall, Timmins, Guelph, Waterloo-Kitchener, Niagara Falls, London, Stratford, Oshawa, etc.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Are there any between Sudbury and Winnipeg?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, at the head of the lakes, at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Your question, Mr. Garland, if I understand it correctly is do we send them where there are the most opportunities. We do, where we have developed the most opportunities.

Mr. GARLAND: How do you weigh the question of good opportunity and perhaps higher wages and better working conditions for the immigrant against the need which may exist. For instance, in North Bay the demand for domestic help may be 20 per cent less than the demand for domestic help in the city

of Toronto and yet the need may be very real. In that case what would be the policy we have that continues that channeling of people into the major centres?

Mr. SMITH: We endeavour to keep them away from the larger centres wherever possible and point out the higher cost of living in the larger centres.

Mr. GARLAND: That is done?

Mr. SMITH: Yes. Whether we are successful in these arrangements is problematical. We do endeavour to do that.

Mr. GARLAND: I suppose there are cases where they have friends in the larger centres.

Mr. SMITH: We do not try to offset a person who has friends or relatives in a certain area from going to that certain area; unless it is obviously to their detriment.

Mr. DUPUIS: One thing that I find strange is that in view of the employment situation in our country presently that an employer should ask for immigrants for jobs that they have open. In what trades would that particularly happen?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In a general way we keep in constant touch with the Department of Labour and we do not grant visas for open placement in those occupations in which we are told there is a large number of applicants in the employment offices here in Canada. If, in other words, there seem to be plenty of people now in Canada applying for jobs in these occupations we do not give visas abroad; that is for open placement. We do not make the same restriction in the sponsored cases; I mean family sponsored, I do not mean sponsored by an employer. No employer could sponsor immigrants and get them in, knowingly, when there are people here in the same occupations looking for work. We work closely and continuously with the Department of Labour to avoid that very thing.

Mr. DUPUIS: Maybe I should address my question to the Department of Labour, but in what trades would there be a shortage of labour presently? This might, of course be answered by the Department of Labour.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that it would be quite proper for you to ask the question of us because we are the ones who are causing this trouble if anyone is causing it. If in fact we are bringing in immigrants in occupations where there is already considerable unemployment we are the ones to blame, not the Department of Labour. I think perhaps here we have a document which I believe has never been made public before but which I have no objection having made public. This is the result of the discussions at the time we were working out our targets for the year 1955.

Now, I should point out right away that this is a guess. My deputy minister thinks that I am wrong in calling it a guess; he says it should be called an estimate. But, the committee knows I quite often use simple and vulgar terms. It is, we think, a very intelligent guess. It is made not just by our department; it is made by our department and the Department of Labour and made after consultation with the trades unions, their official organizations and with the federation of agriculture, and a great many other voluntary bodies in this country. Of course, I wish to make this other reservation about it, that the open placement has not started yet. These are just the occupations which we think we are likely to have need of during the course of 1955. We do not start bringing in open placement cases before March which is now upon us.

Mr. FULTON: This is based on a survey which you make regularly every summer and fall for the following year?

Mr. SMITH: That is right.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Before we permit entry of the open placement immigrants we will make whatever checks and reviews we can in order to try to keep the list up to date and from time to time during the summer, as circumstances change, we change these categories just as fast as we can. It was just about June, I think, that we stopped bringing in unskilled labour last year. We had a situation in Canada where there was no shortage of unskilled labour, but there was an acute shortage in quite a number of skilled trades and where there would have been less employment of unskilled labour had we not met the demand for this skilled labour to enable work to go on.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I see on this form there are architects and engineers. Are these immigrants, before leaving, informed that in most of our professions today they cannot be admitted before the expiration of five years?

Mr. FORTIER: They are all informed as far as professions are concerned as to the situation which exists in Canada in the particular provinces.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the minister will explain the form.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, the minister is very poor at this kind of jargon, and I think that I will ask the deputy minister to explain.

Mr. FORTIER: The reference in this document to code number is a reference to the I.L.O. (International Labour Organization) code number, because that is the way in which these occupations are listed in most of the European countries. In order to have a similar system, we use the I.L.O. code.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am glad to know that, too.

Mr. FULTON: What is the basis of this program?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that it would be much more sensible if the deputy minister answered that.

The CHAIRMAN: This document which we are considering, gentlemen, is dated January 1, 1955 and headed "Occupational Selection List No. 1/55—General List".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director should explain this.

Mr. SMITH: We have been forced to use the I.L.O. code.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The question is as to how we worked out this document.

Mr. SMITH: The code used is a different one from the one used in Canada because it is familiar to those who are being selected, whereas the D.B.S. code used in Canada is not. We get from the field every year in the fall the opportunities which present themselves to our field officers. Those particulars are sent here to us. We transfer those from the individual position into the general family group, as you see here. When we get this information, we send it overseas in the form known to our fieldmen, in the Canadian D.B.S. family groups. They are then able to transfer that to the I.L.O. coding with which they are familiar.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that Mr. Fulton is interested so much in that as in how we prepare this list here in Canada.

Mr. FULTON: Could you give us a word on the survey which your field officers make and with whom they cooperate in the departments of Labour and Immigration in making that survey, and so on?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that all the committee is interested in that point.

Mr. DUPUIS: If I understand it correctly, this list shows the positions that would be open to immigrants. Is that right?

Mr. SMITH: That is correct, for open placement.

Mr. DUPUIS: Take page nine, for instance. Under code No. 7.99 I find that roofers are requested. Excuse me, but I have to make up my mind first in French and then translate it. I myself have seen applications under the heading of roofers or people working in that line of construction, but I see that you have a reference showing a need of roofers. You see if you can find workers for that particular trade.

Mr. SMITH: We have established that roofers are needed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Does the list show how many?

Mr. SMITH: No, the list does not.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): You have "XX" after it. In Montreal you would have to have "XXX" on it.

Mr. DUPUIS: Anyway I would not ask my bricklayer to go where XX's are needed.

Mr. HELLYER: What does "except" mean?

The CHAIRMAN: It says "roofers" and "except Roof Thatchers and Roofers, other". What does that mean?

Mr. FORTIER: "Roofers" under code No. 7.99 is a general description. Then there is a special specification of roof thatchers, which is code No. 7.99.80, and another of other roofers, which is code No. 7.99.XX. There is only one classification under the I.L.O. code which is accepted in the roofing trade, if you want to call it that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should think that there must be some kind of special skill required. I am interpreting this purely as a layman. Apparently the ordinary, common or garden variety of roofers are not admitted, but only special categories, which are not shown on this list.

Mr. HELLYER: They are allowed to arrive only between March 1 and September 30?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. GARLAND: What about the numbers? Is there any limiting factor?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the rule there is that whenever the National Employment Service tells us that there no longer seems to be any demand we stop them and amend our list. This list is under constant amendment throughout the year.

Mr. NESBITT: What is a clamshell operator? Is that a type of machine?

Mr. CAMERON (Nanaimo): A dredging machine.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is that a trick question for me, Mr. Nesbitt?

Mr. NESBITT: No, I just saw it on page nine. As it is grouped with piledrivers, I assume that a clamshell is a machine.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, gentlemen, if we are going to go into details on this list I think we should bring someone here who is an expert on the subject.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Nickel Belt): What we are interested in is to find out how the department bases its requirements for these skills.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The question has been asked as to how we make up this list in Canada. I think that Mr. Smith could go ahead and tell us that.

Mr. SMITH: As I said before, we get the survey of the opportunities and requirements from our field staff.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Nickel Belt): Could you not take a specific trade with which you are conversant? Take "Beauticians", for instance, or some other trade.

Mr. SMITH: Take a carpenter, for instance. I think that is a general one. We will find in certain areas that they do not have a sufficient number of carpenters to complete a building program that they have. Our officers will report that to us.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Where are "Carpenters"?

Mr. CANNON: On page six, code No. 7.41.

Mr. DUPUIS: I want to follow the meaning, and when I do not understand something I prefer to say so. Do you mean to tell me that you cannot find enough carpenters in the country, and that you have to get immigrants to fill such jobs? Is that what you were going to tell me?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is exactly what Mr. Smith was going to try to explain. Perhaps after he has been enabled to make his explanation you would have something concrete to disagree with.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Nickel Belt): I think it is a clerical error, but in my copy I have not "Roof Thatchers", but "Ross Thatchers".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought of that, Mr. Chairman, but I was considerate of the committee and did not point it out.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Smith, will you explain this? Gentlemen, will you please bear in mind that the reporter has to take down everything that is said and he has to hear it in order to get it down.

Mr. SMITH: In certain areas we get requests for carpenters. There may be surpluses in other areas, but they may not be prepared to leave their homes and go to these areas. These opportunities are then brought to the attention of the department and compiled. Then we have meetings with the Department of Labour to ascertain whether there is a need for this particular type of immigrant in these areas, and if so they let us know what their requirements indicate.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I could perhaps interrupt you, Mr. Smith, I should like to point out that we also ask the Department of Labour whether they can meet the requests in one area from another area before we think of going abroad. That is the point that is really in your mind, Mr. Dupuis.

Mr. SMITH: Then we discuss our needs with the Department of Labour and endeavour to ascertain through other departments, such as Department of Trade and Commerce, and the Bank of Canada, and the building trades, as to what the needs will be. We formulate a program and send that overseas in the hope that we can find the persons with the required qualifications in countries where we have facilities to process them.

Mr. MICHENER: How many men of the field and inspectional service staff collect the information which Mr. Smith has just told us about, from all parts of Canada? I see that there are 1,439 in the field and inspectional services staff, and they are mostly Immigration officers. Are they the people who get this information about opportunities for work?

Mr. SMITH: Some are, but a very small number of those who are engaged on border or ocean inspection are engaged in the development of opportunities.

Mr. MICHENER: Under item 69, which of those men turn in to the department the information on which the form is based?

The CHAIRMAN: In the estimates?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that it is item 67.

Mr. MICHENER: It is on page 146, "Field and Inspectional Service, Canada". I take it that that is the general description.

Mr. SMITH: I would have to get that information.

Mr. MICHENER: About how many men report?

Mr. SMITH: I would say, very roughly, about 115 throughout Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: Are they only at your Immigration centres or are they travelling men who go about for the purpose of finding this information?

Mr. SMITH: They have headquarters, but they are continuously on the road and operate under what we call the inland offices, such as Oshawa and others, located throughout Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should like to say something about this. I was in the office in Winnipeg one morning and I met one of the settlement officers who was primarily concerned with settling people on farms. I lived for 30 years of my life in Manitoba and I know many of the areas quite well. I was not able to mention any community I knew in the province about which that man did not know something, and he had been to most of them. I said that while driving around I had kept my eyes open and I had seen quite a number of abandoned farms, and I asked him why he did not try to get some more people to go there. He replied, "Yes, you saw quite a number of abandoned farms, because no one has been able to make a living off those farms in that particular area. We examined it and we do not think it is a good place to send immigrants if we want them to get established". I mentioned another place, and he said, "We have quite a few there already." This is the only personal experience that I have had with this matter, but I was quite impressed with the knowledge that this man had of the agricultural opportunities. That was his primary duty there in Winnipeg.

The CHAIRMAN: A general answer has been made. Three people have asked for the floor: Mr. Cameron, Mr. Monteith and Mr. Henry. I should like to maintain some order in this. I think I should ask Mr. Cameron to put his question now, then Mr. Monteith, and then Mr. Henry.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not want to interrupt if there is to be more discussion on these farms. My question does not concern them.

The CHAIRMAN: Does yours, Mr. Monteith?

Mr. MONTEITH: No, not particularly.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Henry?

Mr. HENRY: I was interested in the remarks of the minister about certain farms not being commercially profitable. I was wondering if we have any figures as to the over-all position of the farms, as to how much farm land there is in Canada that would be profitable for immigrants and how much there is that would not be.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am told that we would have such information in the department, but there is no one here now who could give it.

Mr. HENRY: I think that we should put something along those lines on the record, and I would ask that that be done. My friend on the right suggests that it be broken down by provinces.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We will be glad to give the best information we can on that.

Mr. HENRY: I should like to ask a question of Mr. Smith. He continually speaks of procuring job opportunities and listing them. I am wondering what document he receives from the Department of Labour or the U.I.C. Does he receive it at the national level or the local level?

Mr. SMITH: We deal with them at both levels. There is no document; there is just a letter or a concurrence by the Department of Labour, or it is done through meetings. No document comes from the U.I.C. or the National Employment Service.

Mr. HENRY: Your officers at the local level establish this data by personal interview, is that right?

Mr. SMITH: That is right.

Mr. HENRY: Having done that, before you compile this list No. 1 which we are considering, do you have any over-all figures as to the numbers of these people that may be needed in these occupations that are listed?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, we do, Mr. Henry, but they are only tentative figures and subject to change, as the minister said.

Mr. HENRY: Then I take it that, as you watch the intake, you remove the occupations when in your opinion you have reached your quota?

Mr. SMITH: That is correct.

Mr. HENRY: But you do not necessarily distribute your quota among your offices?

Mr. SMITH: No.

Mr. HENRY: Then, I shall immediately revert back to the Toronto area. I understood the minister to say that one fifth of the immigrants into Canada do arrive in the Toronto area.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What I said was that I had made the guess, for which I took the responsibility, that about one fifth of the immigrants who have come to Canada since the war have settled in the Toronto area.

Mr. HENRY: That is in the post-war period?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, and I think one fifth is, if anything, low.

Mr. HENRY: I was concerned about this figure of 16,000 open placement cases having arrived. I presume that was for the post-war period?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. That was Mr. Michener's arithmetic for the year 1954. Mr. Michener's guess is made on the same kind of basis on which mine was made, being the guess of a layman, and I am sure that the department would not speak with the same kind of carelessness about figures as Mr. Michener and I do.

Mr. HENRY: Then, going back to the 134 people receiving assistance in a single week in February, Mr. Smith I presume puts them in private rooms in individual houses?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, or into a hostel like the Salvation Army.

Mr. HENRY: Have you had any trouble getting accommodation for those whom you have to place?

Mr. SMITH: No. Most of them are in rooms or in hostels when they come to us and we continue that accommodation.

Mr. HENRY: So there is no need for public housing?

Mr. SMITH: No.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I left my place open for people to discuss this form.

The CHAIRMAN: Your place will be kept.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): This is not the discussion for which I stepped aside.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Michener I believe has a question about the form.

Mr. MICHENER: My problem which I wish to put to the minister is this. You have in Canada the National Employment Service and presumably their job is to know where there is work and where there are opportunities. Here we have 110, or some number of officials, who were budgeted for here whose job is to do the same thing in a different way or at least to do the same thing. My question is, why is the information that you can get through the Department of Labour officials not adequate for your job, or is it adequate? What is the explanation of what to me looks like repetition?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that it would be embarrassing for a civil servant to have to answer questions about another department. However, I am willing to give my own explanation for this. The National Employment Service is primarily, as I understand it, concerned with registering the people who want work and the opportunities for jobs that are brought to their attention, and while I do understand, subject to correction, that they do do a certain amount of field work to try to get all the people who may be looking for work to register, and particularly to get potential employers to list their jobs with them, their primary function is to provide machinery for the people who come to them.

Now, our purpose in the Department of Immigration, as defined in government policy, is to increase the population of this country through immigration. Our officers are not running any kind of central bureau at all. They have their headquarters at these various places but they are peregrinating types or travelling salesmen who are going out looking for something new which might be exploited and developed. They are not trying to find an opportunity to slip an immigrant into a job which a Canadian might otherwise get. In fact our whole policy is the exact reverse.

A lot of these immigrants, it should be remembered, are not people who come here to look for jobs. A lot of them are coming to start a little business with a little capital, or a big business with a lot of capital. Quite a number are coming to establish themselves on farms and farms are no concern of the Department of Labour at all, except for farm labour. I think that everyone knows there is a shortage of farm labour even now.

Mr. MICHENER: Has the minister given thought to a different approach to secure any information which his department wants? Surely, when you have another department which does a good part of the job—I admit that they do not know about farming or business opportunities—it would be more economical to add to the work that the National Employment Service does, have them do a little for enquiring on your behalf, and save money that way rather than set up a separate service.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can make an answer which I assure the committee is a genuinely modest one. I have been the minister only for seven or eight months and I am constantly reminded that I did not take my duties very seriously for the first two—I admit that—because I was in Newfoundland. I have been trying at first to learn what has been going on in this department for myself and become familiar with it before suggesting many changes. In fact, up until now I think I have been responsible for only one change of any consequence in the department. This case you might be interested in as a human interest story. I did happen to find out when I went to Halifax and saw that Italian ship, that British subjects, United States citizens, and French citizens who were passengers on the ship were allowed while the ship was in harbour at Halifax to go ashore and visit Halifax but that the citizens of other European countries who were through passengers were not allowed to go ashore. I thought that this was a pretty inhospitable way for us to behave here in Canada. Mr. Smith did his best to discourage me. He said, "You are going to have trouble; some of these people are going to stay and we are going to have to have the police look for them and then we will have the expense of deporting them." I considered it for quite a while. I was urged very strongly by both members of parliament for Halifax to do something about it. My own instinct was to do something about it and I finally persuaded Mr. Smith that he could work out some administrative arrangement to do it. I believe we have had to hire an extra employee to do it. Mr. Smith informs me that we had to hire two extra employees to do it.

Mr. MICHENER: This is certainly a subject for inquiry.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite frankly I just do not feel that I yet know enough about what Mr. Michener suggests to make changes yet.

Mr. BYRNE: I am pleased that the minister is not changing his policy every day and is taking his time.

These estimated 110 or 100 field men I think have other responsibilities than just with placement after the immigrant comes here. Are they occupied solely going around looking for opportunities, or do they do some other work?

Mr. SMITH: They do other investigation work. They find these opportunities in the course of their other duties.

Mr. GARLAND: It seems to me that in the skilled and unskilled trades on this list it is pretty wide open. In the professions and in the professional and technical field what is the significance of "will be referred to branch headquarters for approval"? The reason I am asking that is it seems to me we are always concerned in this country about our professional and technical people going across the border.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I know the explanation of that, and again I do not think we should ask a civil servant to give an explanation. I know I will get in trouble by saying this, but in the professions they have perhaps tighter trade unions than they have in other fields. We do not want doctors, lawyers, or accountants or engineers to come to this country believing that they can immediately start in to practise their profession and then find when they get here that the rules of the profession—which are not made by parliament but are made elsewhere—do not allow them to do it. We think that would be a very stupid policy and that is why, for certain of these professions, we have the application referred to the branch headquarters so that there will not be mistakes and disappointments.

Mr. GARLAND: My reason for asking the question is that it seems to me there is a lack of information on that point throughout the country.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As you know, of course, all these things are under the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities.

Mr. NESBITT: I have one question on this matter. Are there any arrangements with the provinces with respect to a number of these technical people such as motor mechanics who might come from England and arrive here and find that they cannot get a position because they cannot meet the local requirements for a motor mechanic's papers, and so on.

Mr. SMITH: They are all told what the requirements are. We obtain the requirements from the different provinces and unions and send those overseas. They are all told what they may expect when they arrive. Certain cities and certain areas will not allow them to work without certain qualifications and they are all told what those qualifications and requirements are before they come. They are told in most cases they will have to step down from what they consider to be their qualifications until they have acquired the procedures and methods used in the particular area to which they are going.

Mr. NESBITT: Who tells them that?

Mr. SMITH: Our visa officer overseas when they apply.

Mr. NESBITT: There is no chance that they would not be told that?

Mr. SMITH: Perhaps in the case of some British and American people who are not required to go to our office; but our office is always available to them for the information.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could the minister tell us if the department enters into any sort of agreement or arrangement with provincial or local educational authorities with respect to language classes?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That has nothing to do with the Immigration branch at all, Mr. Cameron. I wonder if you would reserve that question until the officials of the Citizenship branch are here.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Do you not think that the officers of the Immigration branch are covering much more ground for opportunities than the unemployment insurance people are covering?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is what I was trying to say. I would not say much more ground, but they are covering rather different ground.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I know they are in my part of the country.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are intended to, and we do make an honest effort to avoid duplication. Now, I do not say that it is always avoided. I do not claim that for a minute, but we do make an honest effort not to do over again what they do, and I think they do the same thing.

Mr. MONTEITH: This is somewhat along the same line. It has to do with the accounting of these various offices. As I understand it, particularly in the smaller centres, the party in charge of your office is holding a dual position in that he has something to do with labour and something to do with your department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That has never come to my notice.

Mr. MONTEITH: They frequently have the same quarters. I am thinking of Stratford, my home town.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean they are in the same building?

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That can happen, but their offices are quite separate and distinct. I could see many advantages in having them close together.

Mr. MONTEITH: I quite agree. I think it is an excellent idea, more economical and everything else, but I am wondering are there any staffs who do any work whatsoever for the Department of Labour?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. MONTEITH: The cost of a building, like rental for an office we will say, is that split? Do you pay part?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is paid by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is none of it charged back to you?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe there is a slight exception. I seem to remember, when I was going through my ABC's for the estimates, that I enquired why we had to pay rent to the customs department. Apparently there is joint occupancy of some places along the border, small buildings which Customs were allowed to build which do not belong to the Deparment of Public Works but to National Revenue. As we share those offices in some cases and as the customs department does not actually want to pay anything for Immigration they make us pay a share of the rent. I suppose 99 per cent of all the premises we occupy in Canada the Department of Public Works pays for and provides and furnishes for our department without charge on our appropriation.

Mr. MONTEITH: We come down to this, that outside of rent all your expenses are distinct from the Department of Labour in these joint offices and are allocated to your department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, apart from rent and furniture and that sort of thing. They are not joint offices, though they may be adjoining.

Mr. MONTEITH: Suppose a plumber comes out to Canada and gets a job and he is supposed to join the plumbing union or something of that nature. There is never any difficulty that way, is there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that Mr. Smith should answer that.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There would be some difficulty. He has to pass a test by the union to belong to that union.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are you as tough as the medical profession?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Just about.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I rather suspected it from your charges.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): We do not get the governmental support or the prestige.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to know more about this. If a plumber by trade comes out to Canada and he gets a job in a construction firm or something of that nature, is he not permitted to join the union?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes. If I might be allowed to explain. He will be taken on as a plumber's helper and after a certain period the union will arrange for him to pass his test and he will be accepted as a journeyman plumber.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): The standards are not the same across Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): An employer would not be allowed to hire him as a journeyman plumber; he would have to serve as a plumber's helper for a certain period of time.

Mr. MONTEITH: Roughly how long?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It would depend on his background.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I presume you mean his technical background and not where he comes from.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): If he is a qualified plumber from the old country he may be a plumber's helper only six months.

Mr. MICHENER: Plumbers are a little more lenient than the musicians' union. I had an instance of a young concert pianist from Germany who was really a competent musician. He was advised that he could not join the union until he was in Canada six months.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know about that, Mr. Michener, but you were once in a position in another jurisdiction where you could have done something about that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton is next on the list, then Mr. Henry.

Mr. FULTON: I should like to ask some questions about these farm workers. On page four of the list it is shown that livestock farmers and graziers, general, are allowed to arrive between March 1 and July 31, dairy farmers at any time, dairy farm workers between March 1 and September 30, livestock farm workers, other, between March 1 and July 31, and livestock farmers and graziers, other, between March 1 and July 31. In other words there appears to be a very restricted season during which farm workers in the livestock and dairy industry are allowed to come into Canada. It was my impression that there is a general shortage of farm labour, and I do not understand the reason for the very severe restriction on their entry.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director ought to answer that question.

Mr. SMITH: There is a shortage of farm workers in seasonal periods. We want the employer to indicate that there is work on the farm for them throughout the year. As you know, many of our farmers do say that they require help the year round, but when it comes to the fall they say, "We have no further work; you have an alternative, either to accept lower wages or to seek employment elsewhere." Therefore, so that we do not have a surplus

of these farm workers leaving the farms and coming into the cities in the wintertime, we restrict the period of entry. There is a shortage all the year round on dairy farms, as we know, and we can place dairy farmers at any time of the year, because we are not getting nearly as many dairy farmers as we need. "Dairy farmer" means a man who is working at least 60 per cent of his time in the barns and with the cattle, milking them and caring for them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Might I, as a member of the committee, ask Mr. Smith a question: I notice that dairy farmers are allowed in at any time but dairy farm workers are restricted to the period between March 1 and September 30. I am not clear about that.

Mr. SMITH: There is a difference, Mr. Pickersgill. One is a worker and the other is a dairy farmer.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is that someone who is going to establish his own farm?

Mr. SMITH: His intention is to establish his own farm. He may be a worker for a period until he becomes acquainted with our methods.

Mr. FULTON: What is the basis on which you have set this restricted season for "Livestock Farm Workers, Other", March 1 to July 31? Where I come from, most of the heavy work on the farms certainly starts in the spring but the harvest season, the time when they put up their hay and grain, is rather later in the year than July 31.

Mr. SMITH: It is seasonal work. Large numbers are required in the fall for the harvest, and we are fearful that they will be laid off upon the completion of the harvest. Therefore we want these people to come here and be established earlier in the year so that they have a better than 75 per cent chance of remaining in year-round employment.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If you are not on a farm by July 31, your chances of getting employment are not too good, I should imagine, in most parts of the country.

Mr. HENRY: As a specific example, Mr. Smith, I am looking at code No. 7.20, "Garment Designers and Pattern Makers, except 7.20.XX, Garment Designers and Pattern Makers, Other". Who could stay within the meaning of that?

Mr. SMITH: I would have to look into that.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What is the significance of those dates, March 1 and September 30? Is that the period in which an immigrant can make an application overseas?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The period when he may land here. He can apply at any time.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does it refer to the time when his application is accepted?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He would not get a visa enabling him to come here at that time.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): This applies to landing dates?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: I have a question on the time of movement of immigrants. Would you like to open that at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Byrne, did you have a question?

Mr. BYRNE: On page four, under "Occupation", code No. 5.01, it states that "Miners, Underground (excluding Coal Miners)" are required. It then states the exceptions are soft-rock miners. If these are not required, the inference is that they do require hard-rock miners. Would they be working on gold or on base metals?

Mr. SMITH: There have been very few applications from the gold mine operators, but there has been some demand in base metals.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): While we are on page four, I wonder if Mr. Fulton would have anything to ask about pet breeders.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is there a shortage of them?

The CHAIRMAN: Has your question, Mr. Michener, to do with item 66?

Mr. MICHENER: No, it is a general question on the time of movement of immigrants to this country.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, if I might make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to take items 66, 67 and 68 together.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that item 69 has some special features and it could be dealt with separately from the other three items. Questions are bound to range over the other three.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take items 66, 67 and 68 together, then.

Mr. MICHENER: It is obviously a good approach to immigration to prepare a list such as this for the guidance of the overseas officers so that people may be sent here at a time when they can be employed, providing that the availability of shipping is such that immigration will not be restricted at a time when you want to bring them in. As everybody knows, the great travel period for tourists is the summertime, and apparently that is the time when the open placement immigrant has to come to Canada. So he has to compete with the tourist trade for shipping space. If he came in the winter he would not only get a reduced rate but there would also be more space available. Are we losing any good immigrants because we insist on them coming at the peak of the shipping season?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I could make one general point before a more detailed answer is made. I understand that in open placement cases we do our best to discourage people from bringing their families with them when they come. We say, "Go over and get yourself established, and then bring your family in the winter, when it is not so hard to get facilities for travel and by which time you will have some place to bring them to". We cannot dictate, but we do suggest that.

Mr. MICHENER: My friends are asking whether I am speaking as the president of a steamship company.

Mr. FULTON: It should be laid up in the winter.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director might say a further word about this matter.

Mr. SMITH: As Mr. Pickersgill has said, our plan is to bring all our open placement cases and workers here during the period from March 1 to September 30. This year is the first year in which we have had offered to us throughout the season from March 1 to September 30 sufficient shipping so that we know that they can all arrive during the period that we have programmed month by month. In years gone by we have had a shortage. We have had an insurance in being a member of I.C.E.M.—that is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—who provided ships under charter for the transport of migrants, principally from Germany and Austria. We also utilized them a year ago when it was established that there was a shortage of accommodations from the United Kingdom. We went to the steamship companies in the United Kingdom, members of the North Atlantic Conference and asked them if they could not get some ships for us during the peak tourist period. The reply was, "No". We then went to I.C.E.M. and asked if they could bring in some ships under charter for the movement of British migrants to Canada. They met our requirements and furnished us with a ship. This

year, from the indications and the information which the North Atlantic Conference has given us, we have sufficient shipping both from the continent and from the United Kingdom; in fact, we have a surplus. I doubt very much if we could process any more immigrants than those for which they have space. This is the first time that we have been in this happy position.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that, regardless of the experiences in the immediate post-war years, you can be selective from this point on as to the time of arrival of immigrants, without interfering with the numbers that you take.

Mr. SMITH: That is correct. Certain companies have assured us that for this year they are not going to withdraw the old ships from service. It was our fear that they might withdraw a large number of older ships as soon as the new ships come into service.

Mr. MICHENER: We all know that conditions were different at earlier periods. Since the minister has referred to my earlier responsibility, I may say that I remember when the Ontario government brought 7,000 immigrants from Britain by air because there was no shipping available.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: For two or three years we brought a good many immigrants here under contract with T.C.A., in exactly the same way and for the same reason.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps you were coerced into it by the example of Mr. Michener.

Mr. MICHENER: I think that that is a very fair rider.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we take it that these items 66, 67 and 68 are carried?

Mr. FULTON: I do not want to hold up all three items, but I wanted to follow a line of questioning at our next meeting, involving immigration and some of the administrative problems.

The CHAIRMAN: What about item 67, "Field and Inspectional Service"?

Mr. MICHENER: That is, in Canada?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I think that we ought to have an opportunity to discuss field services abroad, but I would be content with that.

The CHAIRMAN: Does item 67 carry?

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps item 66 should be kept open for questions which I wish to ask in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN: We will carry item 67 tentatively, anyway. With regard to item 69, we have already dealt with the subject of assistance for immigrants in Canada while awaiting employment. Can we carry item 69 tentatively?

Mr. MICHENER: I have further questions on that.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we look forward to getting through these items with sufficient speed to allow us to ask Mr. Duggan to be here on Monday to deal with item 60? It would be useless to have him here wasting his time if we were not likely to finish discussion on Immigration.

Mr. FULTON: I do not think so. I have a line of questions which I should like to ask. I felt that I should not ask them this morning, but to exhaust them properly would take the better part of a session.

The CHAIRMAN: You think that there is no need to bring Mr. Duggan back on Monday?

Mr. FULTON: No.

The CHAIRMAN: That is fine. We will adjourn till Monday, at 10.30 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 7

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer, and Mr. L. A. Couture, Legal Adviser.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

84598—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, March 7, 1955

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Fulton, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, Monteith, Nesbitt, Pickersgill, Tucker, Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel, and Mr. L. A. Couture, Legal Adviser.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Monteith,—

That the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration lay before the Committee a copy of each of the four reports on administrative procedures in the Immigration Branch dated July 15th, 1954, July 20th, 1954, August 5th, 1954, and August 10th, 1954, respectively, and filed with the Deputy Minister of the said Department, and referred to in the proceedings of the Committee on Wednesday, March 2nd, 1955, together with a report on any action taken in consequence.

Mr. McLeod, seconded by Mr. Yuill, moved the following as a proposed amendment,—

That the authors of the four reports on the administrative proceedings in the Immigration Branch dated July 15th, July 19th, August 5th, and August 10th, in the year 1954, should make these reports available to this Committee.

Following discussion, Mr. McLeod withdrew his proposed amendment and the Chairman ruled the motion of Mr. Fulton out of order.

The ruling of the Chair having been appealed, it was sustained on the following recorded division:

Yeas: Messrs. Byrne, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, and Pickersgill.—10.

Nays: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Fulton, Monteith, Nesbitt, and Yuill. —5.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Monteith,—

That the Committee report to the House that in the opinion of the Committee its task of reviewing the estimates and work of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and of the Immigration Branch thereof, will be facilitated by the production of copies of certain reports on administrative procedures in the Immigration Branch dated July 15, 1954, July 20, 1954, respectively, and filed with the Deputy Minister of the said Department, and recommends that the House order production of the said copies accordingly and that they be referred to this Committee on being received.

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

54598—1½

Yeas: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Fulton, Monteith, Nesbitt and Yuill.—5.

Nays: Messrs. Byrne, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, and Pickersgill.—10

The Committee resumed consideration of the estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. L. A. Couture, Legal Adviser to the Department, was questioned regarding certain prosecutions and was retired.

Agreed,—That the consideration of the Estimates of the National Gallery of Canada be the first order of business on Tuesday morning.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.00 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, March 8.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MONDAY, March 7th, 1955.

10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen. There is a quorum so we will proceed.

There is some question about whether we shall take the National Gallery tomorrow morning. I think we should definitely decide that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am quite agreeable if the rest of the committee wish to interrupt the ordinary course of things to do that.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, one of our members who has to be away for a period has a particular interest in the National Gallery and did make the request if it is convenient to the committee, although we realize it would be a concession.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take it first tomorrow, and we will meet at 10.00 o'clock because there is a cabinet meeting, and by meeting at 10.00 o'clock the minister will be able to get away at 12.00 o'clock. There cannot be a meeting on Wednesday, and the minister will not be back for the meeting on Thursday morning, so we will meet on Thursday afternoon and again on Friday afternoon. The schedule of meetings this week therefore will be: tomorrow morning at 10.00 o'clock, Thursday afternoon at 3.30 and Friday afternoon at 3.30. We are on item 68, "Field and Inspectional Service Abroad."

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I asked at the last meeting that we be given certain information in order to follow a line of questioning on the administration of the Immigration branch. I have a motion to make now. Thinking the matter over during the weekend I feel, and I know some of my colleagues feel the same way, that it would be very desirable if we could obtain these reports of the Bar Association Sub-committee, which have been referred to, in order to understand the nature of the suggestions which have been made for administrative reform. The matter has not been before the committee by way of a concrete motion although it was referred to in the letter I read from Mr. Taylor dated March 2nd, indicating that he, as the person who filed the documents with the deputy minister, would have no objection to their being produced by him. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Monteith:

> That the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration lay before the committee a copy of each of the four reports on the administrative procedures in the Immigration branch dated July 15th, 1954, July 20th, 1954, August 5th, 1954 and August 10th, 1954, respectively, and filed with the deputy minister of the said department, and referred to in the proceedings of the committee on Wednesday, March 2nd, 1955, together with a report on any action taken in consequence.

Mr. DECORE: Would you read that motion again please?

The CHAIRMAN: (The chairman reads the motion).

Mr. Minister, have you anything to say about that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have. Even if this motion was passed it would be quite impossible for me to comply with it fully. I have not been able to find, and to the best of my knowledge, have never seen—and the deputy minister informs me to the best of his knowledge he has never seen—these two documents dated August 5 and August 10, 1954, which Mr.

Taylor said in the letter Mr. Fulton read the other day had been given to the deputy minister in Winnipeg. The deputy minister is not prepared to say they were not given to him in Winnipeg, but he has told me he has not the slightest recollection of them having been given to him in Winnipeg. We have examined all our files in the department carefully to see if they could be found anywhere in the department and we have been quite unable to find them. This leads me to believe that it is just as likely that Mr. Taylor's recollections are faulty as that the deputy minister's are. In any case, these documents are not in the possession of the department or, if they are, they cannot be found. We have documents corresponding in date to the other two that are referred to and I have no doubt they are the same documents, but I wish to emphasize again the point I have made several times before to this committee, that I have never received these documents from any one who has been authorized to transmit them to me.

The only way they came into my possession is the fact that a junior member of this committee of the Canadian Bar Association, Mr. Taylor, gave them to my deputy minister and I do not think it would be a proper thing for me to lay those documents before this committee on that kind of authorization. We know that one member of this Canadian Bar Association subcommittee, who has spoken in the presence of members of this committee—I refer to our colleague Mr. Dickey—says that he did not approve these documents; and no one has heard anything from Mr. McDonald as to whether he does or does not want them made public. Mr. Taylor told me in a letter which I read to the committee that he did not want them circulated or distributed. Apparently he has now changed his mind. If Mr. Taylor wants to have these documents tabled here by Mr. Fulton I will have no objection whatever. I would be very glad indeed, speaking personally, to have these documents made public. I have said to this committee and in the House, at every stage, that I would like all the members of the committee to see what is in them. But I am not going to take the responsibility for making public documents that purport to be from the Canadian Bar Association or from duly authorized members of the Canadian Bar Association unless I receive them from those people. If someone else wants to make them public for some other purpose he is at perfect liberty to do so, and if they are made public I will be very happy indeed to be examined about their contents.

It seems to me the person who really has the obligation to make these documents public under any rules of procedure that I can conceive of is the one member of parliament who has taken the responsibility of quoting bits and pieces he says are in these documents. He is not a member of this committee. I cannot understand the reticence of that gentleman, particularly in view of his oft proclaimed desire to have public affairs conducted in public and to avoid any secrecy. I do not know why Mr. Diefenbaker is so shy, so reticent about making public the whole of these documents from which he has quoted bits and pieces. So far as I am concerned, sir, I would of course oppose this motion for the reasons I have given. If it were passed it would still be quite impossible for me to comply with it, because I have not in my possession nor in the possession of my department all the documents referred to.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Did you wish to speak, Mr. Byrne?

Mr. FULTON: With the approval of my seconder, perhaps I could say this. In view of what the minister says, I must accept his statement that not all the documents referred to are in the department's possession now, and therefore I would change the motion by striking out the words "August 5, 1954 and August 10, 1954", and it would then include only the two documents which the minister says he has.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the purpose of this committee is, as was understood by the House on the occasion when the motion was carried to set up the committee, that it was to deal with the estimates of various departments of government. This is not a committee on immigration; neither is it a committee on the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. We have voted in the House certain powers to this committee, and I think that we should carry on. I see no evidence of the withholding on the part of the minister of information that may be requested under our terms of reference, but our terms of reference do not provide that the committee shall decide to bring witnesses or send for papers and things. That was decided quite definitely on the second occasion after the committee met. It was decided by the chairman subsequently that a motion to that effect was out of order in that it had been dealt with by the committee. So another motion now along the same general lines gives me personally the impression that it is simply to forestall this committee in the job that it has set out to do.

As late as June 10, 1952 a committee was set up for the purpose of examining the Immigration Act, and at that time a special committee was appointed to consider a bill, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and so on. That was not so long ago. The committee examined the entire Act, perhaps some members will say in too short a time, but in any event it was quite a large bill and there was no serious objection to the way the Act had been administered. It had definitely been done under the terms of reference, and we were empowered to call people before the committee. I have a list here of those who appeared before the committee at the afternoon sitting of June 18, 1952. It is quite a large list and includes the Trans-Canada Airlines, the C.P.R., and Mr. Creswell of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration—about 10 or 12 different people.

If everyone who feels that he has a better idea of how the Department of Citizenship and Immigration should be administered appears before us, then this committee would be foundering around here for the greater part of this session. This is, after all, an Estimates committee. As I have said earlier, I know of labour unions who feel that our policy is not correct, and there may possibly be other people; but I am sent here as a representative to decide in parliament what the policy should be, and the vast majority in the House have decided that the policy so far is the correct one. Our duties now are to deal with the estimates. Mr. Thatcher has indicated that he thinks there are too many in the personnel branch and he wants that number reduced by six; and there may be other cases where we may feel that we need to reduce expenditures. I am not prepared to support a motion asking all and sundry to come before the committee, and neither am I prepared to support motions to hear the impressions of people who have no genuine authority to appear before us. I certainly intend to oppose this motion if the chair sees fit to accept the motion.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I should like to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I saw Mr. Cameron first. Mr. McLeod will be next.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I want to deal with the point of view expressed by Mr. Byrne. I think that we should have this quite clear in our minds. It is quite true that this is an Estimates committee, but in all my experience of examining these government estimates I have certainly been under the impression that the purpose is not merely to examine the dollars and cents of the estimates but also to investigate the whole administration of the department. I think that we should keep that firmly in mind, that it is not out of order for members of the committee to seek information about the way in which the department is handled as well as the actual details of specific expenditure.

Mr. McLEOD: Mr. Chairman, in this matter I think a general desire has been expressed by most members of the committee that we do have an opportunity to examine the documents. But I can quite agree with the minister that it is not his responsibility to file these documents. I believe that I expressed the opinion on another occasion, and I should like to mention it again this time, that there is a general desire to see these documents. Therefore, I should like to amend that motion to the effect that, instead of having the department table these particular documents referred to, they be tabled by the authors of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by "the authors"?

Mr. McLEOD: I have not the exact wording. The authors of the report would naturally include the committee members, and they would have to concur in it.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: That has already been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McLeod, perhaps while Mr. Fulton is speaking you could write out the amendment that you would like to make, or if you could come to the table here you could tell the clerk just what you want.

Mr. FULTON: On the question of the amendment, it is not for me to raise a point of order and I am not going to raise it now as a point of order; but, dealing with Mr. McLeod's suggestion, I may say it would be rather welcome to me personally if it could be accepted, because in my view it would then involve the necessity of having Mr. Taylor, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Dickey come before the committee to table their reports, prepared to answer questions about them. That was the suggestion which I made in the first place. I do not know whether you will receive Mr. McLeod's amendment as being in order or not, but if you will and if it carries the implications that I see, that it is one way of getting these gentlemen before the committee, I should be very happy indeed to accept it. I want to make a further point clear: my motion, as it read, referred to four reports and gave their dates. The minister has stated that he does not have two of them and cannot find them in the files. So there would be two slight changes to the motion. Instead of reading "a copy of each of the four reports", it would read "a copy of each of the two reports" and the words "August 5, 1954 and August 10, 1954" would be eliminated. If, of course, Mr. McLeod's amendment were accepted as being in order, then it would be possible, if these gentlemen are to come and table the reports and give evidence, to include all four reports. In that case the word "four" would be restored, and the dates would be restored to the motion, I assume.

I should like to deal with the points raised by Mr. Pickersgill and Mr. Byrne. Mr. Pickersgill said that Mr. Taylor had changed his mind. It is not very relevant, but I think it should be pointed out, for the sake of accuracy, that Mr. Taylor has not changed his mind. It was made clear in the main report that he did not desire that the reports be circulated until after the minister had had a chance to study and consider them. The minister has had that chance. Mr. Taylor now says that he has no objection to their being tabled by the minister. So there is no question of a change of mind. The minister then said, "Why doesn't Mr. Diefenbaker table the reports?" I am seeking to be accurate and to establish that any discussion by this committee, of these reports and of the administrative deficiencies that were pointed out therein, will be on the basis of the documents that the department has and that the minister had a chance to study. The minister has said that he has never seen some of the documents Mr. Diefenbaker referred to. I have therefore moved that those documents which the minister admits having seen and admits as being in the possession of the department be tabled. The minister says he has seen them, and I am suggesting that he table them in the committee so that we may have the benefit of the comments and the points made in those reports which the Department has.

Now, as to Mr. Byrne's objection, which, as I see it, was twofold: his first point being that there was a committee in 1952 which had the opportunity to examine the administration of the Act. I would remind him and you, Mr. Chairman, that that committee was set up for the express purpose of considering a bill to revise the Immigration Act, which was referred to that committee. It is well established practice that a committee of that sort set up for the express purpose of considering a particular bill is strictly limited in its terms of reference to the bill before it. Therefore, there would be no proper opportunity as of right for the committee to go into all the details of the administration of the department or the administration of the Immigration branch. The committee would be strictly limited to the terms of reference which, as I recall them, were to consider that particular bill referred to it.

Secondly, Mr. Byrne went on from there to say that this present committee is not one which should examine the administration of the department. I suggest to you, and I find myself in entire agreement with Mr. Cameron on this, that this committee reviewing the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration must take into consideration whether or not the people of Canada are getting value for the money that they are being asked to vote for this department. It is a very relevant part of that consideration to examine the way in which the department administers the Immigration Act, which forms a very large part of its work. If we are not going to be free to go into that we will not be able to arrive at an intelligent judgment as to whether or not the money being asked for is being wisely spent, and whether that much is needed.

The hon. minister has told us over and over again that he would have no objection to these documents being produced. He intimated there was absolutely nothing in them of any serious nature, so far as allegations of administrative deficiencies are concerned.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think Mr. Fulton had better let me speak for myself. I never said any such thing. I said I was not impressed by the allegations.

Mr. FULTON: Well it is on the record, and if that be the minister's position I suggest that the committee be allowed to decide, uninfluenced by what the minister may now say, whether or not it would assist our investigation to have these reports tabled.

Mr. DECORE: Do I understand that the amendment has been accepted as part of the main motion?

Mr. FULTON: I said if it meant that these gentlemen were to come and appear before the committee I would certainly accept it.

Mr. DECORE: You are accepting that as part of the main motion?

Mr. FULTON: I have intimated I would not be opposed to the amendment if it meant that these gentlemen would have to appear before the committee.

Mr. MCLEOD: I would like to qualify that. There was nothing contained in my amendment that these gentlemen should lay their report personally. The amendment, and I now have it written down reads:

> That the authors of the four reports on the administrative procedure in the Immigration branch dated July 15, July 19, August 5 and August 10 in the year 1954 should make these reports available to this committee.

Mr. BYRNE: I would remind Mr. Cameron that despite all his great experience this is the first committee of this type on which he has sat. It is unique, both in Ottawa and the provincial legislature. Furthermore, as I said earlier, I am not here to put forward questions instituted by labour unions or committees of the Bar Association. I sometimes feel, perhaps, that my own experience, my age itself, gives me in some respects as mature a perspective of these matters as some young lawyer, for instance, and I am here to ask my own

questions and I believe it is not my present capacity to ask that certain cases be reversed whatever the committee at this moment feels about it. If there are certain cases which Mr. Fulton has in mind, then I have certain cases in mind also. For example I may believe that a Chinese boy named Wing—he cannot be called Wong, because there are 400 millions of them, and they cannot be Wong—should enter, and I may be confident that I am right, just as Mr. Fulton is confident he is right. But 300,000 applications represent something very extensive, and I am not going to try to change the policy because one or two things happen which are displeasing.

It is not for Mr. Taylor, or any representatives of any committee, to tell me what questions I should ask. That is my job here. If this committee were dealing with policy I would be prepared to hear anyone from any area or any committee. But it is not. It is not dealing with immigration policy but with the estimates of that department, and that is going to keep us extremely busy, Mr. Chairman, judging by the way things are shaping up now.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to point out that the committee on External Affairs certainly are going into administration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Byrne did not say we would not go into administration; he said we should not go into policy.

Mr. FULTON: These reports deal with administration, not policy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Just put them on the table and let us see them and then we would not have to have these long procedural debates.

Mr. JUTRAS: I would like to know what is the position with regard to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I was waiting until everybody had spoken. I have been accused of being dictatorial and I wanted to be sure everyone had had a chance to speak. I am ready to give a ruling with regard to this motion if everyone has spoken on it.

Mr. JUTRAS: I should like to say a word on the main motion. It seems to me that the amendment is for the purpose of making these reports available to the committee. It seems to me it would be the proper thing for the Canadian Bar Association to have them published first. However, that is their privilege, and I do not think it is up to us to spur them on. If they had wanted to publish them it seems to me they would have done so. On the main motion it seems to me that we are wasting a lot of time. These reports cannot be considered in any shape or form as departmental or government reports. They were not even made for the department. They were made for the Canadian Bar Association and then, in their wisdom, the authors have not proceeded to the full extent of making them available to the Canadian Bar Association as such.

Now here we have a resolution asking the hon. minister to take the responsibility for making these reports public; the mover of the resolution is also a member of the bar association who has the reports on hand and could very well take the responsibility of doing it. He says he will not take the responsibility. The hon. minister has them, and he is asking the minister, as a member of the committee and not as head of the department to do what he himself is not prepared to do. It seems to me the whole thing is ridiculous and that we are wasting a lot of time.

Mr. DECORE: It seems to me, too, that we have been spending a lot of time on this matter so far. I see no reason why the Canadian bar association should become a political football in this committee. Who is Mr. Taylor? Has he the authority of the Canadian Bar to express the views of the Canadian bar on the administration of the Immigration department? Furthermore it is a fact that the reports referred to have not been accepted by the Canadian Bar

Association. It is a report by an individual or individuals and we have wasted a lot of time on this already. I think the motion is clearly out of order.

Mr. DUPUIS: Why should not Mr. Fulton get the permission of the Bar Association to table the documents because I do not think the hon. minister himself can take the chance of putting the report in front of us. It would involve the bar association and I think that is a responsibility which Mr. Fulton does not want to take himself.

Mr. HENRY: As a member of the Canadian Bar Association I suggest that if there is a reason for Mr. Fulton not wanting to table these papers it is because the Bar Association itself is not in accord with what the papers say.

Mr. FULTON: Absolutely incorrect.

Mr. HENRY: I am against involving the bar association any further in this matter. Mr. Fulton must know something about the principle of stare decisis for I heard him talking about it in 1949 ad nauseam in the House of Commons, and this committee seems to have dealt already with this matter in effect more than once during these sittings. I do suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there should be some end to this question of procedure. I am under the impression that we have dealt with the Canadian Bar Association and these reports and I think we should get on with the work of examining expenditures.

Mr. FULTON: The question of the production of the reports has not been before the committee for decision. I have been in conversation with the two gentlemen, who are continuing members of the subcommittee of the Canadian Bar, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Taylor, and asked them whether the reports were secret or confidential. They said: "No." I asked them if they would have any objection to their production here by the hon. minister and they said: "No."

Mr. DECORE: Did you ask them if they had the general authority from the Canadian Bar Association?

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I read the letter from Mr. Taylor underlining the conditions under which the documents were handed to the department and stating he could have no objection to their production. That letter is on the record. It looks as if the minister does not want to produce them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Fulton is of the opinion that Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald have the necessary authority to authorize the publication of these documents, then let him get authority from them to publish them himself. He is a member of the bar. I am not. He has all these documents while I have only two of them.

If Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald have the necessary authority to authorize the publication of these documents, then let Mr. Fulton get from them the authority to publish them here himself. If he does that, I shall be very happy and we will be saving an awful lot of time which we have been wasting up to now.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, the minister is guilty of the very accusation which he seeks to direct against me, because I read into the record a letter from Mr. Taylor on March 2. That letter is in our records and it speaks for itself. I believe it effectively disposes of the statement that my argument is without foundation. I have made this motion in two parts, asking for the production of documents which are in the possession of the department: because it would be to the benefit of the committee to see those documents produced by the department and asking also for a report of what action, if any, the department has taken as a consequence.

The CHAIRMAN: In regard to this matter, I would say there are two ways in which it could be dealt with. One is to entertain the motion even if I

do not think it is in order, and to have the committee vote on it. The other is for me to do my duty as I see it and to rule that it is out of order if I think it is.

But before I do that, I would like to make a few general observations as to what has happened in this committee. I made a ruling the other day in regard to various matters and subsequently thereto one of the members of the committee gave an interview to the press indicating that on account of this ruling, certain parties belonging to this committee, the Progressive Conservative party and the C.C.F. party, upon finding the ruling sustained by the committee—the ruling of the chair—were contemplating withdrawing from the committee.

I suppose the only purpose in that is to put the chairman under pressure that if he dares to make a ruling which he thinks is right, but which they disapprove of to threaten that the committee might blow up under his chairmanship.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps I might disabuse your mind of that misunderstanding right away, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not see any other purpose of that interview except that of putting the chairman of the committee under pressure.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, please allow me to clear up any misunderstanding there may be. The statement made had reference to your attitude and conduct in insisting that a member of the committee be seated and in not allowing him to argue a point of order before you made your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: On that point, I had heard the argument on the alleged question of privilege and the suggestion that there was a right to discuss in this committee something that had been done in the House of Commons, and it was so clearly out of order that I desired to make a ruling on it when I was constantly interrupted. Obviously the chair must have the right to cut off debate on something which is clearly out of order.

Certain members wanted to further discuss the matter, and I asked them to resume their seats, something which I have the right to do. It was not dictatorial at all. We had spent almost two meetings discussing a matter which was clearly out of order.

If this committee is going to do the job entrusted to it by the House of Commons, then it must obey the rules. To suggest that because I finally—after listening to this debate for one meeting and half of another on something which was clearly out of order—and no student of the rules would have said otherwise—because I insisted upon the debate being terminated, and then be confronted with the suggestion made outside the committee to the press that because two of the members of this committee did not succeed in making me give way on something which I repeatedly indicated was out of order, was an infraction of the privileges of members of this committee and was a very improper action.

I suggest it was very improper for any member of this committee to go to the press and try to influence the committee by words like that. I think it showed a very improper attitude towards the House which set us up and gave us our terms of reference. However, I do not intend to be influenced by any of these threats.

It is our duty to do our jobs as best we can, and there are certain courses which are open to us under our terms of reference. I was glad that the Social Credit party would not take part in this procedure. But I was very surprised to hear that the C.C.F. party, which I thought believed in our doing business in this committee and not trying to go outside the committee to the press to put the committee under pressure, was represented as being in agreement with that attitude.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that any members of the C.C.F. party went to the press? I am not going to have it said that I went to the press.

The CHAIRMAN: I was surprised that according to the press the C.C.F. was in agreement with that attitude. However, I take it from your statement that you are not in agreement with that attitude. It is more or less what I would have expected, that you were not in agreement with such an attitude, but it was put in the papers that the C.C.F. were ready to follow Mr. Fulton in withdrawing from the committee. I was rather surprised to hear that the C.C.F. was ready to follow those tactics, but I take it from what you say that they were not prepared to follow Mr. Fulton.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege: I rise to correct your incorrect statement. I have done so before and I must do so again.

I was approached by the press and asked what had happened. I explained that the chairman had interrupted a member who was seeking to argue upon a point of order before the chairman made his ruling.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, surely there were members of the press present at the committee meeting in question.

Mr. FULTON: And what I said, Mr. Chairman, was that it all bears towards this point: that if it was going to be your attitude, if we were not going to be allowed to argue points of order, and to make our submissions prior to the chairman's rulings, and to make other suggestions as to the procedure, the committee would be a waste of time and we might as well withdraw. If I did not express myself sufficiently clearly to the press, or if you have been under any misunderstanding as to what is my attitude, I want to take this opportunity to clear it up.

The impression which I intended to convey is that if the chairman interrupts members and makes them sit down when arguing points of order which they have the right to do, then the committee is going to become a waste of time. It was on that basis that I made a statement to the press as a result of a request from members of the press as to what had happened.

Mr. DECORE: Is Mr. Fulton saying that he was misquoted by the press?

Mr. FULTON: I certainly do not. I do not recall exactly what I was quoted as saying, because I have not got the press clipping before me. I am not one of those who seek refuge in suggesting that they are misquoted, when I am confronted with what I am reported to have said. You may produce to me the quotation, and if you want to base criticism upon it, I will meet it. Mr. Cameron is here and he can speak for himself.

The CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Cameron speak for a minute.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, it is quite true that I did not go to the press. I do not, personally, approve of committee members going to the press. But I think I am in complete support of Mr. Fulton's opinion that if you continue to deny to the members of this committee the right to debate points of order, then the committee is going to be completely useless, and I think it is quite likely that Mr. Fulton and other members of this committee may very well have gathered the idea that my colleague and I—for it was my colleague Mr. Thatcher who was told to sit down when he sought to discuss the point of order—that the members of this committee might very well have gained the impression that we have reached the end of our tether and were prepared to walk out. As it happened, we had not reached it, but we may reach it yet.

Mr. DECORE: How can he say that the chairman denied the right to argue on a point of order when we spent two meetings of this committee on the very same thing?

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, I indicated at the end of the previous meeting that I was going to make a ruling on the motion of Mr. Fulton, at the beginning of the next meeting. At the start of the next meeing I was constantly interrupted by certain members who wanted to discuss a question of privilege and then another point of order. Of course, the chairman must have the right to regulate the order of procedure in the committee. This motion had been made at a previous meeting and I said that the first thing at the following meeting I was going to make a ruling on it. When I endeavoured to make the ruling there was a question of privilege and then a further point of order raised before I could make the ruling on the first point. I asked the member to resume his seat until I could make the ruling on the first point which was before the committee. That is what happened and I mention this to make it very plain that so far as I am concerned I propose to do my duty and no threats are going to divert me from it. I tried to indicate to the committee that the ruling I proposed to make would be one that I did not wish to make, but I would have to do what I thought was right. I find myself exactly in that position this morning.

First of all, as to the amendment by Mr. McLeod, as I understand it, the point that he has in mind is that he seeks to express the idea by this amendment that this subcommittee should make it clear that they have no objection to these reports, or whatever they are, being made public. Now, I would think, gentlemen, that that being what Mr. McLeod has in mind I doubt very much if it would be in order for us as a parliamentary committee to express an opinion as to what action should be taken by a subcommittee of the Canadian Bar Association. While we might have views on it, I do not think it would be in order for us to express an opinion as to the way the Canadian Bar Association should transact its business. So, while I think that many of the members of the committee might feel as Mr. McLeod does, that it would be very helpful if this subcommittee could get authority from the Canadian Bar Association to authorize the minister to release any reports that were placed in his hands, I doubt very much if we actually should endeavour to influence this subcommittee of the Canadian Bar Association by resolution passed at this committee. Anyway I do not think it is a proper amendment to the motion of Mr. Fulton.

If Mr. McLeod, after I dispose of the motion of Mr. Fulton, wishes to bring forward a motion like that, while it might not be desirable for us to advise the Canadian Bar Association, perhaps it would not be strictly out of order. But, I would ask Mr. McLeod just to clear up the matter if he would be prepared to withdraw his amendment which I do not think really is an amendment, but which makes the matter very complicated. Are you willing, Mr. McLeod, to withdraw your amendment with the understanding that you may resubmit it afterwards as a further motion if you desire to do so?

Mr. MCLEOD: My whole object is more or less to bring this thing to an end. We have had an awful lot of dickering as to who has them and as to who should lay them on the table. I made the amendment that instead of asking the minister to lay the report on the table that we ask the authors of the reports to lay them on the table. I said that there seems to be a general feeling of agreement among the members that we would like to see these reports, and by asking the authors of those reports to lay them on the table and make them available to this committee I think that just in short plain English we are asking them to either "Put up" or "Shut up".

The CHAIRMAN: If it goes further than expressing the opinion that we would like to be able to make them public, if it goes so far as to indicate that they should actually produce them to us, then of course it transgresses on the limitations upon our powers.

Actually, the way the amendment is worded is that the authors of these reports should make these reports available to this committee. It is not very clear what you mean. If you mean that we should ask them to produce these reports to the committee that motion would be out of order. If we are merely expressing the opinion that we would like them to make it clear that it is all right for the reports to be made public then, I say, that is another matter. Would you be prepared to withdraw your amendment or clarify it as to what you really mean? If it means that we are asking these people to produce these papers to the committee then we are sending for papers and is out of order. On the other hand, if you wish merely to express an opinion that they should indicate to the minister they have no objection to these reports being made public, then that is an expression of opinion by the committee. I do not think that it is really within our terms of reference to undertake to advise the Canadian Bar Association as to what they should do, and I think it would be out of order anyway.

Mr. McLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with your line of argument, but in order to facilitate matters I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McLeod.

In regard to Mr. Fulton's motion it has really two parts. One is that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration lay these reports before the committee and these are the reports which the minister says were communicated under certain conditions to the minister. The other part is that the minister should indicate to the committee, or give the commitee a report of any action taken as a consequence of these reports. With reference to the first part of the motion, which indicates that the minister should be asked to present these papers before the committee there are two considerations, one is on the broad question as to whether we have a right to send for papers, in other words the papers are not here and we are asking the minister to bring them in. We can ask the minister questions; any member of the committee as I understand it can bring forward a properly presentable paper and present it to the committee. But quite clearly we have no power to either ask anyone to come before this committee or to ask for any papers to be brought before this committee. That is the way in which we have been set up. The committee of supply of the House itself has no such power. In committee of supply if it desired to have a minister present a paper to the committee that motion has to be made in the House of Commons that those papers should be tabled in the House. The committee of supply has no power to ask a minister to produce any papers. Clearly when we were not given any power to send for papers, persons or things, we have no more power than the committee of supply in the House. If it is desired to have these papers made available a motion would have to be made in the House of Commons to have them tabled by the minister just the same as if it was desired to have them made available to the committee of supply in the House. We have no further power in that regard than the committee of supply. Any attempt to take any further powers is going further than our terms of reference. It seems to me it should be made very clear that when rulings are made of that sort I am just laying down that we should keep within our terms of reference. We are not indicating we are opposed to certain things, but we are saying that the House of Commons set us up with certain powers and when it is asked that we go beyond those powers it is my duty to point out that and rule whether or not we are going beyond such powers and it seems to me that a wrong picture should not be given to these rulings. Now, quite clearly we have no power to send for papers. We have no power to order the minister to produce papers. The House of Commons has that power.

Now, I would point out to the members that if we did have the power, the minister then could raise the question as to whether it is contrary to public

policy or not and he has indicated that he has these papers under such conditions that he would feel he is not entitled to produce them. On that ground the committee could be asked whether they uphold the minister in saying that these were not producible because it is against public policy.

However, we cannot assume powers we do not have. I do not think it is right that I should be expected to permit this committee to exercise powers that can only be exercised by the House of Commons itself.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Might I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What will your position be if at some future time in our committee hearings it becomes plainly evident to every member of the committee that there are some documents that we have to have? Presumably there will have to be a motion passed by this committee asking the House to widen our powers.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing to prevent any member of this committee from putting a motion on the order paper, asking that certain papers be tabled in the House of Commons. If it passed the papers would be available to us. But if we are going to have this committee succeed we must keep within our terms of reference, and I expect the members to uphold me in that. As chairman I am a servant of the House of Commons and also I am a servant of this committee, and it is my job to enforce the rules. I do not think that you would have a whit of respect for me if I did not do so. Now here is the ruling. We have been set up with certain powers. We decided at the outset that we would not ask the House of Commons for the power to send for papers, persons and things. Then, when a motion was made that we send for these particular persons with these papers, I ruled that motion out of order, because the matter had already been decided. Now a motion comes before us for a third time, that we send for these papers. The matter has already been decided, gentlemen, and I must rule it out of order. But, in doing so, I would point out that Mr. Fulton says that he wants to know what action has been taken as a result of these reports being made available to the minister and the deputy minister to the extent that they have. There is nothing whatever, gentlemen, to prevent Mr. Fulton from asking the minister what he has done as a result of getting these reports. He can ask these questions without making any motion to the committee about it. So, when I say that this motion is out of order in that it asks the minister to fetch papers into the committee, every member must see that it is out of order. In regard to the second part, that a report be made by the minister of action taken as a result of getting these papers, Mr. Fulton can proceed at once and ask him as to what he has done. So, gentlemen, at the risk of being again accused of what I have been accused of previously, I am going to rule this motion out of order. I must do so.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with your interpretation of the rules, but of course I admit that you have every right to make a ruling and all I can do is to ask you to submit your ruling to the decision of the committee. Perhaps, to save time, you could poll the committee members.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton has appealed my ruling that this motion is out of order. He has asked that the committee be polled on the matter. Those who are in favour of my ruling being upheld will say "Yea" or "Yes", and those against will say "Nay" or "No".

(A polled vote was taken.)

The CLERK: Yeas 10, nays 5.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the ruling upheld.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I disagree with your ruling, but since you have been sustained on the point of order I should like to make a

motion which I think will meet your point of order, and it is based upon a precedent found in Bourinot. I move, seconded by Mr. Monteith:

> That the committee report to the House that in the opinion of the committee its task of reviewing the estimates and work of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and of the Immigration branch thereof, will be facilitated by the production of copies of certain reports on administration procedures in the Immigration branch dated July 15, 1954, July 20, 1954 respectively, and filed with the deputy minister of the said department, and recommends that the House order production of the said copies accordingly and that they be referred to this committee on being received.

I refer you, sir, to Bourinot, fourth edition, page 470. Bourinot is discussing the powers of committees and so on, and he points out that some committees are to some extent limited by terms of reference. He goes on to say on page 470—

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to rule this motion out of order. I think that the committee at any time has a right to make a report to the House. Under our terms of reference we quite properly could report any recommendation or finding such as is indicated here if the committee wishes to do so. Mr. Fulton has moved that the committee report to the House that in the opinion of the committee its task of reviewing the estimates and work of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and of the Immigration branch thereof, will be facilitated by the production of copies of certain reports on administrative procedures in the Immigration branch dated July 15, 1954 and July 20, 1954, respectively, and filed with the deputy minister of the said department, and recommends that the House order production of the said copies accordingly and that they be referred to this committee on being received. I do not intend to rule that motion out of order. It is a question of whether the committee wish to support Mr. Fulton's motion or not, in the light of what has been said by the hon. minister and other members of the committee about these reports. It may be that some member of the committee might wish to speak further on it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to speak on the matter very briefly, to indicate what my position is. I do not want to prejudge the issue in any way. I shall, of course, vote against this motion because I do not believe the production of these documents would in fact facilitate the work of the committee at all. But I do not want my vote that way to be interpreted as indicating I have the faintest objection to these documents being made public. I want that perfectly clear. I shall be very glad if these documents are made public, because immediately they are made public they will, in my opinion, cease to be of any interest to anybody, and it strikes me that the desperate efforts of Mr. Fulton and Mr. Diefenbaker to keep these documents secret are clear evidence that they agree with my view.

Having said that I think I should also point out that if this motion is turned down, it would appear to me that there is no other procedure by which this matter could be brought before the committee, except for someone to bring the documents in here and make them public on his own responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless a motion were made in the House that these papers be tabled.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, is it the wish of the members that this should be decided by show of hands or by polled vote.

Mr. FULTON: Polled vote.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion moved by Mr. Fulton, that the committee report to the House that in our opinion our task of reviewing these estimates of the work of the department would be facilitated by the production of the copies of these reports and we recommend the House to order the production of the said copies and that they be referred to this committee on being received. If I may explain, there are several parts to this motion: first, we are voting that in our opinion the work of this committee would be facilitated by the production of these papers, then we recommend that the House order the production of these papers and that they be referred to us.

Mr. DECORE: These are only two reports.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. There are really three points to this recommendation. Those in favour of this motion will say "Yea" and those against "Nay".

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, just before the vote is taken, may I say I have been amazed at the amount of information which has been available to this committee during the periods we have spent actually dealing with the votes which have been considered, and it seems to me that those who are bringing forward this motion are doing so in an effort to make the committee less effective. However, I am certainly going to vote against the motion on that basis.

Mr. FULTON: I anticipated that Mr. Byrne would not want any information, so I am not surprised by what he has said.

Mr. MCLEOD: Have we any indication whether or not these reports referred to are signed by the committee, or by an individual of the committee? I want to know whether these are the authentic reports.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can tell you Mr. McLeod, that the documents which I have are not signed by anybody. They are mimeographed documents, and when I say "The document I have" I should, rather, say "The documents handed to my deputy minister."

Mr. FULTON: Is there a mimeographed name on them of the person who signed?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think so, but I would want to inspect them first in order to be sure.

Mr. FULTON: My information is that there is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. Fulton has better information about them than I have.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Perhaps we should put on record here that the Canadian Bar Association has seen these documents and had not thought fit to act on them.

The CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the committee not wishing to debate this matter at length. The question is before you. Will you please answer as your names are called. Those wanting to support Mr. Fulton's motion will say yea, and those contrary minded nay.

The CLERK: Yeas five, nays ten.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is defeated. Now we are on item 68.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one matter Mr. Nesbitt raised the other day about the Beaverbrae, and the conditions on that ship. I have here a letter from a Mr. Henry Stryk of 720 Dundas Street, Woodstock, Ontario which deals with this subject, and I think perhaps it would be in everybody's interest if I read it. He appears to be the person from whom Mr. Nesbitt got the information, and he seems quite happy to have this information made public.

Henry Stryk
720 Dundas St.
Woodstock, Ont.
February 20, 1955.

To whom it may concern.

Since my experiences on board the S.S. Beaverbrae were discussed in Parliament I want to state the facts as they really happened.

I went aboard the Beaverbrae with my wife and our 4-month old baby in August 1948 in Bremerhaven, Germany.

Of course I may say members of the committee will see from the date that this was before there was a Department of Citizenship and Immigration. It was under the old Department of Mines and Resources.

Our passage of $162 each and half the fare for the baby was paid by my sister in Montreal. The Beaverbrae was used to transport wheat to Europe and on the voyage back to Canada the cargoholds were transformed into sleeping quarters for immigrants. Since there were only few cabins for aged people most of the men slept in one huge hold at the front of the ship and the women and children in several smaller holds.

Soon after we left Bremerhaven a boatsparade was held and many people got seasick because of the stormy weather and high seas. Shortly after that the loudspeaker system issued a warning that there would be no meals served unless the decks would be cleaned by the passengers.

There was a Master-of-arms among the crew who was responsible for maintenance of discipline and order. This man recruited every day a labour force from the passengers for cleaning up the ship and help for the kitchen by taking away the cards on which the meals were issued and returning them only after the work was done to his satisfaction. I had to sweep up a lower deck once and my wife was made several times to clean up a toilet in spite of the fact that she had to look after the baby. If somebody protested he was told that the captain had the power to send any troublemaker back to Germany.

There were only a few among the crew who practised these military methods and I am not sure if the officers knew what was going on.

The food was poor by Canadian standards but nobody complained because it was better than the food available in Germany at that time.

Before landing in Quebec each passenger was issued a parcel containing candy, cigarettes, a razor and razorblades for men and a toothbrush and toothpaste for women. Everybody thought this was a sort of welcome present but later on we learned that each parcel had cost $5 and had to be paid in advance together with the passage fare.

Since my wife already possessed a toothbrush and I used to shave before, we would rather have had this money to buy things more needed for a start in a new country.

I am a Canadian citizen now and grateful to my new country for having given me a chance for a good new life. I have never blamed the government or its immigration policy for these incidents and have always though only the shortcomings of a few individuals were responsible for them.

After all these years in this great and free country I would rather forget this episode and have it closed.

Henry Stryk

This letter is signed, and it is signed in ink, by Mr. Henry Stryk.

The CHAIRMAN: And it is dated February 20, 1955.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I think it is really quite shocking to learn what is in that letter. If any member of the committee or any member of the public can give me any authentic information as to any similar conditions in ships where we are carrying immigrants, I shall do everything within my power to see that they are corrected.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is there anyone to see to that?

Mr. NESBITT: I must thank the minister very much for having read the letter. I received it the other day and I forwarded it to the minister. I thought it should be drawn to his attention. My only purpose in mentioning this matter, which took place some time ago, was that in the unhappy event of similar events taking place at the present time, they could be checked up.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I understand Mr. Nesbitt's attitude in the matter and personally I thoroughly approve it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is there anything the department can do to make sure that such a thing does not happen again? I appreciate it that you have no control over shipping companies.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the law of supply and demand, which Mr. Cameron's party tries to repeal, will have something to do with it. In 1948 shipping was very, very short, and shipping companies could sometimes get away with this kind of thing. I do not think many of them did. This was one of the few ships about which we have had complaints. There were a couple of others mentioned the other day. Mr. Smith told us the other day that we have been offered this year all the shipping we will need for the number of immigrants we expect to get. I think it would be quite easy for us, if anything of this sort occurred, to stop patronizing that particular ship. I think the effect would be very salutary.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does the department direct immigrants to specific ships?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Before I get into deep water and founder, I had better ask the director to answer your question.

Mr. SMITH: No. Each immigrant has the right to select his own ship.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do you give them advice or some suggestions?

Mr. SMITH: If they come to us and say that they are unable to get accommodation, then we tell them where accommodation is available, but we do not insist upon them taking our advice. It is up to them to choose their own.

Mr. FULTON: I indicated at the end of our last meeting, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to get some information as to the number and nature of the cases before the courts in Montreal arising out of immigration irregularities. Would the minister or the deputy minister care to give that information now?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I asked Mr. Couture to be here this morning. He is a member of the staff of the Department of Justice who has been assigned to my department, and if I may be permitted to introduce him I shall ask him to speak for us in this matter. Some of these cases are still before the courts, so I think it is much better to have an authorized member of the Department of Justice explain about them because he would know what it was proper to say.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Couture, could you tell the committee the number of cases, and, if you can, a summary of the types of cases, which have been or are now before the courts in Montreal, arising out of incidents in the Montreal office? I think the irregularities were first disclosed in 1952.

Mr. L. A. COUTURE (*Department of Justice*): Mr. Chairman, immigration irregularities in Montreal, concerning Italian immigrants mainly were disclosed to us in 1952. There were four sets of them, and prosecutions were entered.

The first set of prosecutions concerned one former immigration officer by the name of Bourget, and a travel agent by the name of Petrecca, against whom charges were laid in 1953 under section 504 of the Criminal Code.

In the case of Bourget, the charge was that of receiving secret commissions or bribes; and in the case of Petrecca, the charge was that of giving the same to Bourget. Judgment was rendered upon pleas of guilty on April 23, 1954, and fines were imposed on both.

With reference to the second set of prosecutions, charges were laid in 1953 against a former immigration officer, Anfossi, another former immigration officer, named Sullivan, and a travel agent of Montreal by the name of D'Errico.

D'Errico pleaded guilty to having given bribes for secret commissions contrary to section 504 of the Criminal Code and was sentenced to fines, one with respect to each charge, on June 4, 1954.

In 1953 action had been attempted under the Fugitive Offenders Act to bring Sullivan back from England. The legal firm of Russell and Company of London had been retained by the crown for that purpose but since at the time the convictions had not been entered against Anfossi the magistrate's court in London saw fit to dismiss the application under the Fugitive Offenders Act. Anfossi decided to plead not guilty and the charge against him was dismissed.

The third set of prosecutions which might be termed minor in comparison to the others is more or less pending in that the charges as laid were then withdrawn pending the outcome of the fourth and major set of prosecutions.

Mr. FULTON: Those charges in the third set have not been re-laid yet?

Mr. COUTURE: Charges were filed in 1953 and withdrawn in November, 1954, to await the outcome of the major or fourth set of prosecutions. With respect to the fourth set of prosecutions charges were laid on January 10, 1955, involving amongst others former immigration officer Wilson as well as certain persons who were connected with him in the doing of what is described in section 573 of the Criminal Code as conspiracy to commit the indictable offence defined in section 504 as the giving or receiving of secret commissions or bribes. This matter is presently before the court and so are the names of the co-conspirators.

Mr. FULTON: With respect to the fourth set, could you tell us how many of those involved in that set of charges are immigration or former immigration officers, and how many are persons who were not in the employ of the government?

Mr. COUTURE: Only one was a former employee; the person I have named, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FULTON: How many others?

Mr. COUTURE: Five others.

Mr. FULTON: Now, with respect to these matters, Mr. Couture, I wonder if you have any further information. We could take one of the three sets where the charges have either been disposed of or are actually before the courts. Firstly, how much money was involved in the receiving of the secret commissions or bribes, and secondly, what was the effect of the offence, rather what was the effect which the giving and receiving of that bribe had with respect to facilitating the otherwise improper admission of immigrants into Canada? Perhaps if you prefer not to answer the second part, it could be answered by one of the others. What I want to know is, how much money was involved, and secondly, what results did it have? Next, were people, and if so, how many, admitted unlawfully and how was the person who received the bribe able to falsify the records?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would you mind if I interpose one query to Mr. Couture myself. I am not sure, although I have looked at these documents myself, whether the facts in the first and second sets of prosecutions are involved in the cases that are still before the courts and I wonder if Mr. Couture wishes to answer that question first.

Mr. COUTURE: In so far as the question might relate to the three first sets of prosecutions I might say that no answers could be given to your second question, not only because these matters are inter-related and will be dealt with in the course of this major prosecution presently pending, but because the bribes were given not for the same purpose as in the present prosecution. They were not given for the main purpose of getting immigrants into Canada illegally but with a view to obtaining priority. Therefore the second question might be termed not entirely relevant with respect to the first three sets.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps it would be the best way to proceed to ask questions relating to each set individually and then you can tell us whether it is proper to answer or not. With respect to the first set of charges—

Mr. COUTURE: That first set of prosecutions involved former immigration officer Bourget and travel agent Petrecca, both of Montreal.

Mr. FULTON: The charge was receiving and giving, respectively, secret commissions or bribes?

Mr. COUTURE: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Would you have in that case the amount of money improperly given and received, and the action which was sought to have taken on the part of the immigration officer as the result of giving the bribe?

Mr. COUTURE: With respect to the first question, the answer would be that they pleaded guilty to the receiving and giving of bribes amounting to a minimum of $250, in respect of which Petrecca was fined $175. and Bourget $125. The bribes were given so as to give priority to certain cases and not to facilitate the illegal admission into Canada of immigrants.

Mr. FULTON: There was nothing involving falsification of records or anything of that nature in that case?

Mr. COUTURE: Not in that case.

Mr. FULTON: Did it involve the writing of recommendations by the immigration officer concerned with respect to priority? Or in particular how was this immigration officer asked to do or how did he do that which had the result of giving this priority?

Mr. COUTURE: This first case dealt with the placing of names on the processing list in first place, let us say, upon the recommendation of the immigration officer involved. That is, if I may put it this way because otherwise we are dealing with some aspects of the major prosecutions presently before the courts, the purpose of the giving of the bribe was to ensure that the persons sponsored by the giver would receive prior treatment or that the overseeing of his case would not be as stringent.

Mr. FULTON: You mean the supervision, the attention to the details of his case, would not be as stringent?

Mr. COUTURE: The investigation of his case; that would be one aspect of it.

Mr. FULTON: What was the official position of Mr. Bourget? You have referred to him as an immigration officer. What was his official classification? What I am getting at is what was the position of these men who were involved; in what position were they where they could themselves influence the results?

Mr. COUTURE: I understand that Bourget at the time of his dismissal from the service was an immigration inspector.

Mr. FULTON: Can you give me the same sort of information with respect to the second set of charges?

Mr. COUTURE: The second set of charges involved D'Errico, travel agent and Anfossi, former immigration officer—that is inspector—and former Immigration Inspector Sullivan.

D'Errico pleaded guilty to having bribed Anfossi to the extent of $350, and to having bribed Sullivan to the extent of $500. With respect to the first charge he was fined $100. With respect to the second charge he was fined $200. He as the travel agent also sought the improper advance of his cases or, depending on the circumstances, the loose supervision of his applications.

Mr. FULTON: Did the action taken by the immigration officers in that case result in any admissions which would otherwise have been illegal or should have been prevented?

Mr. COUTURE: They might have been irregular but not illegal.

Mr. FULTON: What were the positions of the two people in the departmental employ who were charged here?

Mr. COUTURE: I believe I mentioned they were immigration inspectors.

Mr. FULTON: With respect to the third set I am really satisfied that it would not be proper for me to press the matter because the laying of charges is pending.

With respect to the fourth set, what information are you free to give, along the same lines as my previous questions?

Mr. COUTURE: The charges were filed on January 10, 1955 under section 573, conspiracy to commit the indictable offence of bribery. These in effect deal with the types of problems that you described initially in your question today. We might sum it up in the following fashion without going beyond this: the seeking of illegal admissions into Canada.

Mr. FULTON: I do not want to ask you anything that is not in the charges—Perhaps I had better go back. Charges have actually been laid?

Mr. COUTURE: On January 10, 1955, against six persons.

Mr. FULTON: Do the charges disclose the amounts of money conspired to be paid and received, and the numbers of cases involved? I do not want to ask you anything that is not in the charges themselves.

Mr. COUTURE: The charges as filed relate to a minimum of 75 cases. I mention a minimum since it is referred to as such in the charges. It is the presently known checked maximum. The moneys involved will represent, according to charges presently laid, roughly $100 per case.

Mr. FULTON: The money involved was roughtly $100 per case? Just one immigration official is involved? Mr. Wilson is the only one, I think you told me. Was his official position immigration inspector?

Mr. COUTURE: He was an immigration visa officer in Rome, Italy.

Mr. FULTON: Rome, Italy. But all these charges arose out of applications handled through the Montreal office, is that correct?

Mr. COUTURE: Using the terms of the charge against him, you might say that the conspiracy was conducted in Montreal, Rome and New York.

Mr. FULTON: I have some general questions. Please let me know if you do not think you should answer. You have said, I think, that these cases involved applications for admissions of immigrants from Italy. Were they all in the category of sponsored applications, either for the admission of relatives or alleged relatives of people resident in Canada, or for the admission of people in the general classification of labour asked for by name by specific employers?

Mr. COUTURE: They were either sponsored or general as I recall it.

Mr. FULTON: People coming to take up assigned positions in Canada?

Mr. COUTURE: People coming to Canada by reason of sponsorship on the part of a farmer or of an employer in Canada.

Mr. FULTON: Am I correct in assuming—I am not asking you to be exact—that the great majority in all of these cases were cases of applications sponsored by farmers or other employers in Canada for the admission of specifically designated persons from Italy?

Mr. COUTURE: I would not say that that was the majority.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if I may raise a question here. As the committee knows, I am not a lawyer. I am not the minister responsible for carrying on these prosecutions. It does strike me, however, that the line of questioning now is coming very close to what would be brought out in evidence in the case and I wonder whether we ought to pursue that. I happen to be a member of the government and I would not like to take the responsibility. It is my colleague, the attorney general who is responsible for these cases. I am not trying to withhold anything.

Mr. FULTON: I appreciate the minister's position and I will confine my questions to the cases which have been disposed of. I think that would be much safer and that it would also put Mr. Couture in a less embarrassing position.

Can you answer the question with respect only to the cases which have been disposed of?

Mr. COUTURE: The cases which have been disposed of and the two first sets of prosecutions. I would say, dealt with sponsored applications.

Mr. FULTON: Sponsored by people seeking them as immigrants for the purpose of work, or as relatives?

Mr. COUTURE: For the purpose of work.

Mr. FULTON: That is all the questions I have at the moment on that particular aspect of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Was there anything else you wanted to ask Mr. Couture?

Mr. FULTON: No.

Mr. HENRY: How would the distinction be drawn between what is irregular and what is illegal. I was wondering what it might amount to.

Mr. COUTURE: It could be irregular in so far as the immigrant is concerned and illegal on the part of the applicant's travel agent to seek to have favourable treatment given to the application, and yet it might not void the applicaion.

Mr. FULTON: There is another question. May I ask whether in the cases disposed of there was any evidence of improper declarations, that is the furnishing of incorrect or fraudulent information?

Mr. COUTURE: I do not believe so.

Mr. MCLEOD: The person obtaining these bribes certainly got his money from somewhere. Would there be any evidence to imply that the money was being paid by sponsors into this country, or by the immigrant and his friends?

Mr. COUTURE: With respect to the two first sets of prosecutions, it might be said that this more or less formed part of the charges made to the immigrant for the services of the travel agent or immigration agent.

Mr. BYRNE: There will be no deportations as a result of these offences?

Mr. COUTURE: Not with respect to the three first sets of prosecutions.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There has been no evidence to suggest that perhaps sponsoring employers in this country have been providing money for these people in the cases to which you have referred.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The deputy minister reminds me that these convictions were entered on a plea of guilty and that no evidence was hear, and

I am afraid we might easily be casting aspersions on people where there has been no proof if we attempt to say what might have brought into the evidence. I am very nervous about proceeding in this field.

Mr. MONTEITH: Was the New York ring involved only in the last set of cases?

Mr. COUTURE: Yes. If I have left a wrong impression I would like to correct it. I did not say employers were involved. On the other hand, I did not say to what extent that would be the point. Let us put it this way: I would not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Then thank you very much Mr. Couture.

Mr. FULTON: I would like to ask the deputy minister or the minister if he would describe for us the process of dealing with applications of two specific types, firstly the application by a Canadian citizen for admission to Canada of a person cited in the application as his relative, and secondly the process of dealing with an application in which it is stated that a person in Canada desires the admission of a named person as an employee, say for example on his farm.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to say a word about that, generally. and then I will ask Mr. Smith, who administers the Branch, to deal with the question. In the first place I think it should be made clear that there is no such thing as an application in the technical and legal sense from anybody say except a prospective immigrant. There is nothing in the Act or regulations about sponsorship. That is a matter of administrative policy. The word "applicant" in its legal sense means only the immigrant himself. I say that because I know we shall go on using the word at times with regard to the relatives, from a practical standpoint, although they are not legally applicants. Now I had better ask Mr. Smith to go ahead and describe the process.

Mr. SMITH: Sponsorship by persons in Canada is confined to those who are legally here and in a position to receive and care for the parties that they are sponsoring.

Sponsorship is confined to the close relatives and also to employers who have personal knowledge of workers abroad, both from their suitability, their reliability, and their occupational qualifications.

We request sponsors to complete forms. They are known as form 55. On this form all the particulars regarding the sponsor are furnished, and such information as possible regarding the intending immigrant.

That form is submitted to the nearest immigration officer.

Mr. FULTON: That would be at one of your district offices?

Mr. SMITH: That would be at one of our districts or at an approving office; and upon receipt of form 55 the inspector then inspects the settlement arrangements in connection with the close relative groups.

In regard to the application or the sponsorship of an employer or some named party, the inspector establishes the need for the services of this man, and in many instances he checks with the National Employment Service to see that that particular type of occupation cannot be obtained in this country.

The forms are then completed and approved and sent overseas to the respective officers in charge in the country from which the immigrant is coming.

Mr. FULTON: I am sorry to interrupt, but you said that the forms were inspected, approved, and sent overseas. Does that imply that they are processed at the head office?

Mr. SMITH: They are sent direct from the approving ports. They are not concentrated here at all.

Mr. FULTON: Yes.

Mr. SMITH: They are sent overseas to the inspector in charge of the country from which the immigrant is seeking admission. Upon receipt of the 55, our inspector overseas calls the proposed immigrant to his office on a set date, when he will be in a position to deal with him, and asks him to bring forward his x-rays and radiologist reports. Upon arrival at the office he establishes his identity. He is then examined by officers from a screening standpoint and then referred to the medical officers for the medical examination and finally to our officer who gives him information regarding the conditions in Canada if he so requests that information. Then the officer grants the visa provided of course he has passed the screening and the medical examination. That completes the circle. Then there is the arranging for his transportation which he himself must arrange.

Mr. FULTON: You referred in that chain to examination by the officers for screening purposes. Is that conducted by the officers in the Immigration department overseas, by our officers?

Mr. SMITH: It is done by our officers attached to the mission as a whole.

Mr. FULTON: Are they all in the employ of the Immigration department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to interpose something here. In the description I gave of the screening the other day I pointed out that we did screening for the purpose of the Immigration Act to make sure that the person was not of any prohibited class. That is done by the Immigration department. But, in addition to that we do seek assistance in the security screening from people outside of the department and the people outside of our department seek assistance from certain officials of other governments.

Mr. FULTON: When you, Mr. Smith, speak of screening you are using screening in the sense now mentioned by the minister, that is screening with relation to ordinary requirements by our officers, not screening specifically with relation to security?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But if a circumstance comes to the notice of our officer relating to security he takes notice of it as well.

Mr. FULTON: What, if any, further check of the documents as to the admissibility of the applicant is made? He has now been approved overseas: what if any final check of the papers is made; are they referred back to Canada before the immigrant comes, or is that a final check?

Mr. SMITH: That is the final check and then they are all re-examined at the port of arrival.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: One thing which should be pointed out is that strictly as a matter of law our examination overseas does not comply with the Immigration Act. Even if we pass someone overseas it is necessary in order for me to carry out the duty imposed on me by parliament to have the immigrants examined at our port of entry; that is the only legal examination. However, the other is the examination which determines the result in 99 out of 100 cases.

Mr. FULTON: He is subject to the final examination at the port of entry when he comes over here?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Does this procedure you have outlined, Mr. Smith, apply to cases sponsored by prospective employers and by relatives in Canada? Is the procedure the same in both cases?

Mr. SMITH: Exactly the same in both cases.

Mr. FULTON: Who actually initiates the application? How does it first come? The first officer you mentioned in this chain is the immigration officer at the Canadian district office. How is it initiated with him, by an application from the sponsor or an application from the immigrant?

Mr. SMITH: By an application from the sponsor here in Canada in most cases; that is in all sponsored cases.

Mr. FULTON: Then what other forms are necessary to complete the application apart from the form 55 you mentioned? Are there any forms that the immigrant has to complete other than the three forms tabled the other day?

The CHAIRMAN: You mentioned form 55, Mr. Smith. Did you make that form available to us?

Mr. SMITH: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should have that.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will make it available to the committee.

The only forms which the immigrants complete themselves—or not necessarily themselves—are the O.S. 8, O.S. 8A and Immigration form 1000.

Mr. FULTON: But he has to bring these other documents such as the report on his medical inspection?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: With respect to the status of the immigration officer to whom you referred—as to the powers he exercises in the court of his investigation, and as to his discretion—could you give us a word on that? Who at the district office here and who at the district office overseas actually processes and finally approves these documents?

Mr. SMITH: The final approver here before it is sent overseas in all sponsored cases is the inspector in charge at the authorizing port. There may be some authorizing ports which only have one immigration inspector and he acts as inspector in charge. He has the authority to approve or reject applications subject of course, to where doubt exists when the forms are sent to headquarters for advice; but 95 per cent of the cases are approved and sent overseas by the inspector in charge at the various authorizing ports.

Mr. FULTON: Could you give us the departmental terminology to describe those officers. What is their position on your establishment?

Mr. SMITH: They are immigration officers, immigration inspectors.

Mr. FULTON: Is that the same name as those who do this work overseas? Are they also immigration inspectors?

Mr. SMITH: They are really immigration inspectors but when they are assigned overseas we call them visa officers.

Mr. FULTON: I see it is 12.30.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, does the committee anticipate that the whole of the meeting tomorrow will be taken up with the National Gallery?

Mr. FULTON: I am sorry—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I really would not want to run out of material.

Mr. FULTON:—Mr. Chairman, I could get that information and perhaps give you a call.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We could have the Director of the National Gallery here and also the Immigration branch officials. You would not need the officials of any other branch?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The committee is adjourned to meet again at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in this room. We will commence with items 81 to 83 and then go back to these estimates before us this morning.

The committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 8

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Dr. H. O. McCurry, Director of The National Gallery of Canada; and Mr. D. W. Buchanan, Chief, Industrial Design Division.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

54835—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

ERRATUM (*English Edition only*)

Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, No. 2, dated February 25, 1955.
Page 29: In the fifth paragraph, on line five, DELETE the words "21 I.B.M. machines" and insert therefor "2 I.B.M. machines"

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

TUESDAY, March 8, 1955.
(9)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.00 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Dupuis, Fulton, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Lafontaine, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Nesbitt, Starr, Pickersgill, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel. *From the National Gallery of Canada:* Dr. H. O. McCurry, Director; and Mr. D. W. Buchanan, Chief, Industrial Design Division.

The Committee considered the Main Estimates, 1955-56 of the National Gallery of Canada, Mr. Pickersgill and the officials of the National Gallery answering questions thereon.

Items numbered 81 to 83 inclusive were adopted.

At 12.00 o'clock noon, the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. Thursday, March 10.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

54835—1½

EVIDENCE

March 8, 1955,
10.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a slight correction to be made in the report of the proceedings of February 25. The minister tells me that on page 29, where it refers to 21 I.B.M. machines, it should read "two I.B.M. machines".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apparently the "1" and the "I" were printed as though they were different things.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That is quite a saving.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is obviously a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN: We decided to take items 81, 82 and 83 first this morning.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
	NATIONAL GALLERY OF CANADA					
81	Administration, Operation and Maintenance, including Industrial Design Division....	161	% 250,808	252,185	.....	1,377
82	Payment to the National Gallery Purchase Account for the purpose of acquiring works of art, in conformity with Section 8 of the National Gallery Act.....	163	130,000	130,000		
83	Grant to Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.....	163	4,025	4,025		
			384,833	386,210	.....	1,377

The minister has with him two of his officials whom he will introduce.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Gentlemen, I have asked the Director of the National Gallery, Doctor McCurry, and Mr. Donald Buchanan, head of the industrial design section, to appear. Mr. Brennan and Mr. Abbott are here to assist them with statistical and other information.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, would the minister care to make some comments on where the new National Gallery might be located? It is a little outside the sphere of this committee, but I thought the minister might care to make some comments.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to, because this is a matter of general interest. Of course, strictly speaking it is not my business as minister. I was authorized by the government two or three months ago to write to the Federal District Commission and stress the fact that the present building housing the National Gallery

is quite inadequate both as to space and as to safety. The board of trustees is very concerned indeed about having this valuable collection in that particular building. On their recommendation, I secured authorization from the government to write to the Federal District Commission and ask them if they would give consideration to the use of the part of Majors Hill park which is adjacent to St. Patrick Street, as a site. The reason why this site was suggested was that it does happen to be vacant. I have long observed the experience here in Ottawa with sites that are not vacant. Evicting tenants and getting buildings torn down seems to be quite easy in other places, but in Ottawa it is just impossible.

Mr. DUPUIS: Montreal is the same.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is very frustrating for people who want to get something new done. The F.D.C.—in accordance with the usual procedure—referred this request of mine to the National Capital Planning Committee, which is a committee of the Federal District Commission. The National Capital Planning Committee did not view it with favour. When I learned that, I consulted the board of trustees again. Then I consulted my colleagues, and I was authorized to make a second approach to the Federal District Commission and to ask them to refer the matter back to the National Capital Planning Committee with the suggestion that they meet with the board of trustees of the National Gallery in a joint meeting with a view to recommending a site which would be suitable and available for building in 1956. I have been advised that this joint meeting took place and that both the National Capital Planning Committee and the board of trustees would be satisfied to have a building built at the west end of the Mackenzie King bridge on Elgin street between Albert and Slater streets. There is enough room there for a building. The building that it is suggested should be built there would ultimately be an office building for one of the departments of government. When I say "ultimately", I should imagine that that destiny would not be reached for 10 or 15 years. In the meantime it would be built in such a way that it would be quite suitable for housing the National Gallery. The Federal District Commission has approved of this recommendation. I have been advised that they polled their members, because there was not a meeting for some time. They have approved of it and have so advised me, but I simply have not had time yet to discuss it with my colleagues. Until the government approves of it, it cannot be regarded as a firm decision, but I am very hopeful that it will be approved and that we can go ahead as rapidly as possible with the building. Of course, that will be the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works, and I may say that I consulted the Minister of Public Works last night in anticipation of the meeting this morning and am authorized to say that he and I are in complete agreement as to the desirability of using this site and of going ahead as rapidly as possible. I think that that really covers the whole question.

Mr. FULTON: Would the proposed site occupy the whole of the front of that block between Albert and Slater streets, including the area where the Industrial Design Centre is now located?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, it would require the whole area and, of course, a considerable distance back toward Metcalfe Street.

Mr. CANNON: Would this mean that eventually a new building would be built for the National Gallery?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is what the Federal District Commission proposes. Whether the government will accept that view or not, I do not know. I might add that, while I personally am not sure from the point of view of having the right kind of capital city that this is the best place for the National Gallery, from the narrow standpoint of the National Gallery itself, of course,

it is the best possible site because the National Gallery director and board of trustees and everybody connected with it are primarily interested in having as many people as possible visit the gallery. There is no available site in Ottawa as good as that one from the point of view of visitors; I do not think that there is any question about that.

Mr. FULTON: Where exactly is the site which the National Gallery planning committee recommend? I have not been able to pinpoint it. I understand it is a site not now vacant.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In Cartier square, where the Department of National Defence has the wooden buildings.

Mr. FULTON: Is it suggested that it front on Elgin street?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think the idea is that it should look toward the Driveway. I am not quite sure; as I say, maybe I am pessimistic about these things, but my pessimism is shared by the Minister of Public Works. I think it will be a long time before Cartier square is available for the building of a National Gallery. You cannot build a National Gallery overnight, either.

Mr. MICHENER: I was wondering whether the building would be suitable for the National Gallery and also be suitable as an office building afterwards.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was advised on that personally—and I do not think that it was confidential in any way—by Mr. Mathers, the architect for the National Library. He is one of the senior architects who serves on the National Capital Planning Committee and is a very distinguished architect from Toronto. I raised exactly the same point. He said that there was only one way in which it might not be completely economical. He said he thought that they would want to put slightly higher ceilings in this building than they would if it were just an office building. From every other point of view, a modern office building for a large department would be quite suitable for the gallery.

Mr. MICHENER: It would be used mainly to house paintings?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: The galleries I have visited usually have blank walls, with no windows. It is better if all the light is from the inside and there is no exterior light coming in, for the purpose of viewing the paintings.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps you could discuss that when Mr. Winters' estimates come up. We have not yet made a decision. I have no knowledge myself on that point; I just repeat what Mr. Mathers told me.

Mr. MICHENER: Are we being asked to vote money for that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: At the present session?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, unless we can get a small amount for a start put in the supplementary estimates. Frankly, I have no real expectation that we will be able to ask for anything for the building itself before the year 1956-57, but I am very hopeful that the Minister of Public Works will be in a position to do so then.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: The primary consideration is one of safety, is it not?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a matter of very real concern, because no amount of insurance that could be placed on this collection of paintings would be of any use at all. You would get money with which you could buy something else, but if anything happened to these paintings they could not be replaced; they are unique.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: The government does not, on policy, insure.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite so, but this is really not an insurable risk, because this collection is unique.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be like trying to insure Magna Carta or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FULTON: No one would undertake that with the present government in power.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, it is quite unnecessary.

Mr. CAMERON *(Nanaimo)*: Irrelevant, you mean, do you not?

Mr. MICHENER: Has an estimate been made of the ultimate size in square feet of a building suitable to house the whole National Gallery?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. McCurry could give you that. There are still some differences of view. The point has not been definitely settled.

Mr. MICHENER: You would have an estimate of the amount of space for the National Gallery in the interim building?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would be the same in both cases, I think.

Mr. MCCURRY: I did not know that the subject of the building was coming up.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If it would be satisfactory. I could have Doctor McCurry give us a brief memo, which I could simply file at a subsequent meeting. This matter is not strictly relevant to these estimates anyway, but I would be very glad to do that, because this is a matter of real interest.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, I have a series of questions I should like to direct to Doctor McCurry, but I think it might be better to direct this one to the minister. It is a question on item 82 of the estimates. It is stated that an amount of $130,000 is to go into the purchase account of the National Gallery for the purpose of acquiring works of art. Would the minister explain that? I understand that, in addition to the public moneys, there are certain private donations as well. Could the minister make some comment on that account?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I am going to ask Doctor McCurry to say something after I have said a few words. What you have said about private donations, Mr. Nesbitt, gives me an opportunity to say that we would welcome more of them. The National Gallery is really serving a great national purpose but, as I think we all know—we are all politicians—it is sometimes not too easy to convince our constituents that a large amount of the taxpayers' money should be used for the purpose of buying works of art and if there are, in the country, people who want to provide a great benefaction for the Canadian people, I do not know any better way in which they can use money than to provide it for the purchase of pictures for the National Gallery. As a matter of fact, this money is voted every year in a certain amount which goes into the purchase account and it stays in that purchase account until purchases are made.

Mr. NESBITT: In other words, it builds up from year to year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, it builds up, and sometimes it builds down. In some years more money may be spent out of it than actually goes into it. That depends on what comes on the market and what is available.

Mr. FULTON: Does the minister know if his colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, will facilitate these private donations to which he has referred?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have no precise information about that here. I have had some discussion about it with my colleague, the Minister of Finance. As I understand it our law is not precisely the same as the law in the United States. It has been suggested to me that the matter should be looked at. I

passed that suggestion on quite recently to the Minister of Finance. I did not make any recommendation myself because I did not feel that I had any technical knowledge. I am not an expert in the matter. But I did ask that the people who do have that knowledge should consider it.

Mr. FULTON: There is no provision at the present time?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is some kind of provision in the law, I believe, but I am not an expert in income tax law. I have never given any money myself for this purpose—I am ashamed to say—and therefore it has never arisen as a practical matter for me.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It might be just as well to ring the bell again and bring it to his attention.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is no doubt that what Mr. Nesbitt and I have said this morning, assisted by Mr. Macnaughton, will ring the bell. Mr. Harris will read the newspapers. I would hesitate to make any more private representations to the Minister of Finance at the moment because I think the queue is pretty long already.

Mr. NESBITT: Last year, out of this purchase fund, there was apparently a very excellent collection purchased from the Prince of Liechtenstein. There was some mention of it made last year in the supplementary estimates. There was an item of $360,000 in the supplementary estimates, and I remember at the time asking the then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Harris, a question and I refer now to page 3419 of *Hansard* for last session, March 29. The question was as follows:

> Mr. NESBITT: Can the minister tell us how much was paid for each of these paintings?
>
> Mr. HARRIS: It was a group purchase of the lot at the figure mentioned in the supplementary.

The thing I am now inquisitive about is to be found in the Public Accounts this year which we recently received, at page CC-28. It lists certain payments made to certain people. There is one cheque to a Mr. Paul Drey of New York in the amount of $42,570; and then there is a cheque to His Serene Highness Prince Francis Joseph of Liechtenstein for $550,400. I was wondering which was the figure for the purchase of these paintings; whether it was the $360,000 as Mr. Harris had intimated, as it is stated in *Hansard*, or whether it was the $550,400 which is set out here. Possibly the minister or Mr. McCurry could explain.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall have to ask Mr. McCurry to enlighten the committee about that because, frankly, I do not know.

Mr. H. O. MCCURRY (Director of the National Gallery of Canada): There were two purchases made from the Prince of Liechtenstein. I think these two items have probably come together in the figures which have just been quoted. Actually, the amount paid to him last year was $360,000, as Mr. Harris gave the figures.

Mr. NESBITT: Then why was there this cheque for $550,400?

Mr. MCCURRY: I do not know how the bookeeping was done, but I do know that the exact amount is $360,000. I think the additional amount must have meant a payment made in the previous year.

Mr. NESBITT: In the group that was bought for $360,000 there were, I believe, five paintings?

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes, I think so.

Mr. NESBITT: What would they be?

Mr. MCCURRY: What were the paintings?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes. I remember seeing them many times since; but I do not just recall the details.

Mr. MCCURRY: The group of paintings comprised the following:

Francesco Guardi	S. Maria della Salute, Venice
Bortel Bchaw	A Bavarian Prince
Nicolaes Maes	The Lace-maker
Quentin Massys	The Crucifixion
Hans Memling	The Virgin and Child with St. Anthony, Abbot and a Donor

Mr. NESBITT: What were the other pictures which were previously purchased from His Serene Highness the Prince of Liechtenstein.

Mr. MCCURRY: The ones I am thinking of are the Rembrandt and the two Filippino Lippis, making three pictures.

Mr. NESBITT: And they were purchased in 1952?

Mr. MCCURRY: I think it was 1952 or 1953 but I am not certain.

Mr. MICHENER: Those cheques went out in the 1953-1954 fiscal period.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Brennan says he can get the exact accounting figure for us.

Mr. NESBITT: Were the three pictures which were previously bought, the Rembrandt and the two Filippino Lippis, bought as a group or individually?

Mr. MCCURRY: They were bought as a group.

Mr. NESBITT: You do not remember the figure they were purchased at?

Mr. MCCURRY: I think it was $275,400.

Mr. NESBITT: But $276,000 and $360,000 would amount to more than $550,400.

Mr. MCCURRY: You are quite right. It does not add.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it would be better to wait until we get the figures from the accountant because we obviously have not got those figures here.

Mr. NESBITT: If the minister will bring us the figures, that will be all right.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should think there was some advance payment made, and that $550,400 cleared up the amount that was remaining.

Mr. NESBITT: There are other cheques in the same group I am curious about; one for $42,570 to Mr. Paul Drey of New York, at page CC-28, and another to W. H. Schab of New York for $20,444. Could you tell us what these cheques would be for?

Mr. MCCURRY: I could tell you about the cheque to Paul Drey. It was in final payment for an altar piece by Benozzo Gozzoli.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you had better spell those names for the assistance of the reporter.

Mr. MCCURRY: B-e-n-o-z-z-o and G-o-z-z-o-l-i. That was a second payment. I think the picture was purchased in two payments.

Mr. NESBITT: Was this cheque to Mr. Schab for $20,444 for the purchase of a work of art or was it in the nature of a commission?

Mr. MCCURRY: I am afraid I cannot tell you. I do know that Mr. Schab was paid a commission on the purchase of the Rembrandt and the two Filippino Lippis. But he has also been—we have purchased from him several prints. I am afraid I cannot tell you, offhand, exactly the details.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We would be very glad to supply them. Perhaps I should explain to the committee that we came here expecting to be questioned on the estimates and not on the public accounts. I merely offer that as an excuse.

Mr. CANNON: I was thinking of raising that very point, Mr. Chairman, but I did not want to obstruct.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was trying to explain why we have not got the information right at our fingertips.

Mr. NESBITT: I will keep off straight accounting matters. The thing I was interested in was the manner of acquisition and how much we were paying for these things. With respect to the purchase of these two groups of paintings, did Mr. Schab act as an agent for the purchase of the first group, that is the Rembrandt and the two Filippino Lippis? The next group consists of the Maes and the other paintings, the group of five. Was there an agent concerned in the purchase of these pictures?

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Who was the agent?

Mr. MCCURRY: The name of the agent was Agnew.

Mr. NESBITT: That is a British firm?

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Do you know how much commission was paid?

Mr. MCCURRY: Five per cent, according to my recollection. The arrangement with Agnew was on a sliding scale. If we purchased so much, it was five per cent, and if we went over that amount it was four per cent and so on; it would go down as the purchase increased.

Mr. NESBITT: With respect to the arrangement and the negotiations for the purchase of the Prince of Liechtenstein's collection, I take it there was not sufficient money at that time in the purchase fund to pay for those pictures?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I might say a word about that myself. This was a decision of the government, to make a certain amount of money over and above what was in the ordinary purchase account available for the purchase of the Prince of Liechtenstein's collection.

The reason I happen to be informed about this is that it had to come before the cabinet and we heard—the trustees heard that these pictures might be available for sale to the government of Canada—and that it was perhaps the last opportunity there ever would be for us to get pictures from one of the great European collections.

As I think the members of the committee know, all European countries now virtually prohibit the export of works of art, particularly ancient ones. I use the word "ancient" not in the sense of ancient history, but classics. As it seemed to be an opportunity that was not likely to occur again, and one which ought to be taken advantage of, the government decided to make additional money available, or to ask parliament to make additional money available over and above the ordinary annual grant of the purchase money.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to make it quite clear that I am delighted to see Canada acquire these pictures. I do not want anybody to misunderstand me and say I am opposed to the acquisition of these works of art. I have been inquiring into what were the methods of procedure. Now I know it may be a little difficult to answer this, but I would like to know if the Prince von Liechtenstein had any knowledge that the Canadian government was interested in buying these paintings.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. McCurry could answer that question.

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes, I think the Prince von Liechtenstein understood perfectly that he was sending these pictures out to the National Gallery of Canada for consideration by the board of trustees. There was no purchase made at that time. They were sent on approval, and there was no agent involved.

Mr. NESBITT: Can you tell us the date when the final arrangements were made to purchase these pictures?

Mr. MCCURRY: I think it was probably March, 1952.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is, the first ones.

Mr. MCCURRY: I think so.

Mr. NESBITT: And the second group of five?

Mr. MCCURRY: The second group was in the autumn of 1953.

Mr. NESBITT: When the final arrangements were completed?

Mr. MCCURRY: I cannot say about the final arrangements. Payment was not made for some time.

Mr. NESBITT: No, but the negotiations were completed. In view of that I would like to ask the hon. minister a question. I will preface it by saying again that I am in favour of the government purchasing these works of art from time to time when they come up for sale and I realize they are not readily available. But there has been some confusion and misunderstanding on this occasion about what these works of art actually cost, and the distribution of what part of it was public moneys and what part was due to private donations. Would the minister therefore consider the suggestion—I do not want to put it as a formal motion as yet—that the amount of this estimate be reduced, say, to the sum of one dollar, instead of having an annual amount of $130,000, and then when these occasions arise and the government wishes to acquire certain works of art they could put them in as a supplementary estimate.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think, to be quite candid, that would be a very retrogade step indeed. We have appointed a number of eminent people to the board of trustees of the National Gallery because, frankly, my colleagues and I feel we are not the right type of people to be trustees, and I do not think that any government is apt to have the qualities one would want on a board of trustees. These people give their time gratuitously and some of them are very busy people. One of them is an ex-president of the Canadian Bar Association.

Mr. MONTEITH: What qualification is that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He also happens to be the president of the Art Gallery of Winnipeg and has one of the best private collections in Canada. I believe that if the trustees were to feel that they never knew what resources they were going to have from day to day, and if whenever something came up for purchase they would have to go through the formality of making a submission to the Treasury Board and having a group of ministers without much expert knowledge pass on it, we would not get the kind of competent and interesting people to serve on the board of trustees that we are able to get at present.

Moreover, the purchase fund to which we ask parliament to make a contribution every year is primarily, though not exclusively, for the purpose of purchasing Canadian works of art, and purchases are made every year from that fund whenever it seems to the board of trustees to be wise. But the expenditures which we are considering cover a situation of exceptional nature which is not likely to recur. It does seem to me that when we are talking of half a million dollars or more at one particular time, such a sum represents something which we should go especially to parliament to seek, as we have done in this case. But for a country as rich as Canada to put $150,000 a year into a fund for the buying of pictures is not by any stretch of the imagination an extravagance.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: My learned friend (Mr. Nesbitt) has just said he is much in favour of the gradual acquisition of works of art when they appear

on the market. At the same time he wants to reduce the activities and field of operation of the trustees down to one dollar a year, and tie them up in this way.

Mr. NESBITT: Either Mr. Macnaughton was not listening very carefully, or he was listening and he misunderstood me. I said I was decidedly interested in the acquisition of these things but because of the confusion which had arisen over what was actually paid for these pictures I said that when the chance to buy a number of works came up the government should put in a supplementary estimate as was done last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Actually, on an estimates committee like this I think, technically speaking, the complete answer is that the Act was complied with and the Act provides, in section 8(1):

> Section 8(1) of the National Gallery Act, c. 186, R.S., provided for a special account in the Consolidated Revenue Fund called the National Gallery Purchase Account to which any money appropriated by Parliament in any fiscal year for the purpose of acquiring works of art is to be credited and from which expenditures may be made in that or any subsequent fiscal year for the acquisition of works of art including any costs in connection therewith. An amount of $490,000 provided through Votes 77 and 555 was credited thereto.

So this board operates differently from an ordinary department of government. Parliament has provided that this board can spend, from this fund which is set up, such amounts as it deems proper. Naturally the hon. minister thought that what would be gone into here were the estimates as to what this money was being provided for. Money was paid over into this special fund and it therefore becomes subject to the jurisdiction of the board of trustees. If a member wishes to go into the question of how the board of trustees spends this money, it should be remembered that while the hon. minister has not raised this as an objection, technically we would only have the right to go into that matter if the accounts of the board of trustees had been referred to this committee.

I say that to indicate that the hon. minister was not at fault in not coming prepared to account for the spending of a body for which he merely reports to parliament, and that the suggestion that there is confusion arising out of that is not fair to him. I suppose that with unanimous consent we could go into accounts of the board of trustees that administers this fund, but that matter really was not referred to this committee.

Mr. NESBITT: My only reference to there having been some confusion was not directed toward the present minister in any way. I remember distinctly the interchange with the former minister, Mr. Harris last year, when he said these paintings cost $360,000. That was the only thing which caused any confusion. And members will surely agree that when you look at the public accounts and see the record of a cheque for $550,000, the confusion was only natural.

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Nesbitt is referring to the public accounts and if he examined them he would find that this fund is one which has been set up, and which parliament and other people contribute to.

Mr. MONTEITH: The special operating fund is the one the public contributes to.

The CHAIRMAN: There are two funds, as Mr. Monteith points out. I do not think there has been any suggestion that this was anything else than a contribution to this purchase account, and naturally you should be able to draw from the fact that there is an account to which parliament votes

certain moneys, and from which money may be spent from time to time, that the accounts would not necessarily coincide with the items in Public Accounts in any particular year.

Mr. NESBITT: I am a lawyer and not an accountant, and some of these things are a little confusing to me, and that is why I asked the hon. minister the question.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I can clear up the confusion very simply, though I am neither a lawyer nor an accountaint, but I do know from long experience that the public accounts in any year do not reflect what is in the estimates for the previous year, and they cannot, because there is a rule of the administration—and I defer to Mr. Benidickson on this, but I think it is consecrated in the Financial Administration Act, or the regulations—that bills in the one fiscal year may be paid up to April 30, but not afterwards. Afterwards they go into the public accounts for the subsequent year. So a department of government does not show in the public accounts the same amount spent as the estimates show, simply because when a bill comes in after the 30th of April, it has to be paid out of the current year's appropriations.

Mr. NESBITT: The only thing I wanted to find out was the difference between the $360,000 and the $550,000 and the minister has answered that point.

Mr. FULTON: There has been some inference left that Mr. Nesbitt did not do his "homework", and I think that is very hard to justify. From the reading of *Hansard* he asked the question: "Can the minister tell us how much was paid for each of these paintings" and the minister replied: "It was a group of the lot at the figure mentioned in the supplementary." It has been made quite clear by what Mr. McCurry told us this morning that the total cost was more—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not as to that group. What appears to have happened is this: the bill for the other purchase of the three pictures was also paid in the same fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN: As is quite proper under the Act.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: For instance, I have an account; I bought some shirts this morning, and I know I have not paid last month's bill. It may well be I shall pay it at the same time as I pay this month's bill, but the purchases I made would be separate purchases.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I wanted to ask the hon. minister some questions about the purchases, but most of them have already been answered in the discussion. However—

The CHAIRMAN: Is this a new matter?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): No. The same subject.

I have not been to the National Gallery this year, but last year I was there several times. I presume it was this Liechtenstein collection I saw. They were marked definitely as new acquisitions—Italian and Dutch paintings.

The question arises in my mind as to how far we should pursue this policy of stocking our National Gallery with painting from earlier schools and from European schools. It has struck me as somewhat pathetic the way in which in North America we stuff our galleries with the products of earlier artistic periods. I am not saying that there should not be in the National Gallery representative work of various schools of art but I do think the emphasis should now be placed on the forming of a collection of Canadian art, an art which is not to be despised, because some excellent

results have been achieved. The other day for example a Canadian artist had a show in Paris which was most favourably received.

This then is the suggestion which I would make. I do believe we should be a little hesitant now about buying works of art of earlier periods, no matter how valuable they may be.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Cameron, you talk exactly as my wife does. I am largely in sympathy with you. I do think, however, that we want to have a certain number of paintings representing the art of other countries, but I think the main purpose of the National Gallery should be the acquisition and retention of the best Canadian paintings on a more or less contemporary basis and, of course, picking up those things that were not recognized a quarter of a century ago. As a matter of fact the National Gallery has been extraordinarily prescient about these things. In other days when almost nobody paid any attention to what was being done by Canadian painters Mr. McCurry and his predecessor were acquiring Canadian paintings that are now very valuable indeed. I think it is a piece of extraordinary good luck that we have had such discerning directors who have been so keenly interested in Canadian painting and who have not been afraid to look at new things. As a matter of fact, I believe there have been periods when the National Gallery was regarded as pretty revolutionary by some of the more conventional Canadian painters. How they managed to exist in this rather conventional country of ours and still obtain money from parliament I do not know. I think that it is a very fortunate thing they did and I hope we will go on voting money for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought Mr. Nesbitt was through and I gave Mr. Cameron the floor. Are you through, Mr. Cameron?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Monteith is next.

Mr. MONTEITH: One question goes back to a statement which Mr. McCurry made earlier. He mentioned in the case of this Liechtenstein collection that they were sent over here and there was no agent involved. Was that the $360,000?

Mr. McCURRY: $276,000.

Mr. MONTEITH: You mentioned that you paid Agnew 5 per cent.

Mr. McCURRY: That is another purchase.

Mr. MONTEITH: Referring to this Purchase Account Mr. Chairman, it appears as though it started back in the year 1951-52 when the unexpended balance of the allotment for that year totalling $21,829 was transferred to this Purchase Account. I think that is when it started.

Mr. McCURRY: That is right.

Mr. MONTEITH: Then in 1952-53 in the regular estimates there was an amount of $100,000, in the supplementary estimates $30,000 and in the further supplementary estimates $276,000, a total of $406,000 which added to the $21,829 totals $427,000 odd out of which was spent during the year roughly $108,000 leaving a balance in that fund as at 31st March, 1953 of $319,638. You would also have in the special operating account at the 31st of March, 1953, some $86,000 meaning there was a total of more than $400,000 unexpended funds there. True, only $319,000 odd came from the estimates, but I think it gives somewhat of a confused picture to the department in that the surplus of the department showed something like $4800, and with this increase in the purchase account it would almost look as though the surplus should be increased by a total of $297,000. The converse is true going into 1953-54. Here again you had in the regular estimates $130,000 and in the further supplementary estimates $360,000, a total of $490,000. You started out with $319,000 and added $490,000 and spent $699,000, leaving a balance of $110,000 as at 31st

March 1954. So, if that procedure were followed you automatically show a deficit in the 1953-54 year. It leaves a false impression. I do not know how to suggest it should be done but you would have on hand, at the end of the 31st March, 1953, $319,000 odd in that fund. It was not spent, but it was charged against the estimates.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not follow you. How do you mean that it was charged against the estimates? What happens with respect to the estimates is that parliament votes the money and the money is then paid into the fund and there is no further charging against the estimates.

Mr. MONTEITH: My thought is, for instance, that the further supplementary estimates of 1952-53 come along very very late afterwards, and I am not suggesting it was done, but it affords an opportunity of hiding some funds, $276,000 in that period.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact there was no hiding at all. Because of the very considerable magnitude of these purchases from the Liechtenstein collection it was felt by the board of trustees that they should go to the government and ask the government to provide a special contribution to the fund for these purchases. They could not have bought them out of the fund because there was not enough money provided earlier. Far from hiding them, the government went to parliament and said we want this money specifically for that purchase. When the second purchase came along they went to parliament to get the second vote specifically for that purchase. You will say, "Why did not the government buy it direct?" They did not because it is the board of trustees who buy the pictures and the bill comes to them and they pay the bill. That is the way any fund is managed to which the government makes a contribution. That is what the statute provided in 1951 as the way to do it.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the year 1952-53 there was a total of $406,000 went into this fund.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you please when citing figures, go a little bit slower? The reporter has to get them down.

Mr. MONTEITH: There was a total of $406,000 in the year 1952-53 and a total of $490,000 in the year 1953-54. I am not saying anything against the purpose to which the money was put, but I am pointing out in the further supplementary estimates for 1952-53 there was $276,000. Those further supplementary estimates come out very late. I am not sure of the date, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was probably in May or June.

Mr. FULTON: Usually a month before the close of the year.

Mr. MONTEITH: First of all, there are those two additional estimates, supplementary estimates and further supplementary estimates. The supplementary estimates come out around June and then the further supplementary estimates around the end of the year, and this amount of $276,000 in the year 1952-53 and $360,000 in the year 1953-54 leaves the impression that it would be quite possible if funds were quite plentiful and so on to shove something in there and cut down any surplus.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Surely what members of the opposition are for is to see that the government does not do that. In this case there was no need for the opposition to be vigilant because parliament was told that this money was for the specific purpose of making these exceptional purchases. I do not know how the government could be more candid than it was. It would be completely within the power of the board of trustees, if there was enough money, to have gone ahead and bought the pictures from the fund without telling the government anything about it until they were bought, because the

Act says they can use their discretion once they have the money. But, they did not do that; they came to the government and asked the government to go to parliament; which the government agreed to do to get two specific chunks of money for making these two specific purchases.

Mr. MONTEITH: When did the purchases take place?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They did not take place until after the money was voted.

Mr. MONTEITH: Well, I still claim that these further supplementary estimates, at the end of the year when the government knows how they are doing financially or has a pretty good idea, affords a chance of tucking a little money away.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps you would like to make that speech on the budget debate. It has not much to do with the estimates for this year.

Mr. MONTEITH: On the special operating account is there any special reason why we should not know what is actually spent out of that? All we know is that back in 1952 it was shown how much was spent.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am quite sure there is no secret about it. I will be glad to get the information for you.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the year 1952-53 and 1953-54 if we could have the balance of this special operating account at the 1st of April in each of those two periods, and the donations received—I think there is $30 income from a $1,000 bond or something—then the expenditure made out of that account coming to the balance at the 31st of March in each of those periods.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Do we not get an annual report from the public trustees?

Mr. MONTEITH: I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no reason why those two statements should not be given, the special account and the operating account.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are several copies of the annual report here if any of the other members would like them.

The CHAIRMAN: This is at the back of the report, the special operating account.

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes. Here it is, the last page.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I must say that I apologize to the committee for not being more familiar with the contents of the annual report than I appear to have been.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Monteith just referred to tucking money away in the supplementary estimates. It seems to me that the explanation which the minister gave was that the money which was included in the supplementary estimates was for the specific purpose of buying certain works of art and I fail to understand how you could call that tucking money away.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am returning to the end of March 1953. There was $319,000 in that account plus $83,000 in the special operating, a total of over $400,000 in those accounts. Then there is an item of $360,000 in 1953-54 and $306,000 in 1952-53.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That was for a purchase from the Prince of Liechtenstein.

Mr. CANNON: There was one other point. Mr. Nesbitt suggested that the annual grant of $130,000 a year should be reduced to $1 a year. Did I understand correctly that you said that amount of $130,000 was primarily used to help encourage Canadian arts and Canadian artists?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that most of the purchases out of that account are for Canadian paintings. They are not exclusively for that; the board of trustees use their best judgment.

Mr. CANNON: If that amount were reduced to $1 would it not have an adverse effect on the encouragement which the government gives to Canadian art?

Mr. NESBITT: On the point of privilege, I asked the minister to comment on the suggestion which he did and I was quite satisfied with his comments.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am very glad that Mr. Nesbitt was, because I quite agree with Mr. Cannon that it would. I think the phrase that I myself used was that it would be a very retrograde step. After all, the establishment of this purchase account was a decision made by the last parliament when the new National Gallery Act was passed in 1951. As I think all the members of the committee know, it was based on the recommendation of the Massey Commission that it would be a more satisfactory way of doing this than simply to have the department vote annually a certain amount which would lapse if it were not spent.

Mr. CANNON: Are we to understand that Mr. Nesbitt unconditionally withdraws his suggestion?

Mr. FULTON: Do not be so ridiculous. If a member is not free to ask questions about things like that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, please.

Mr. CANNON: I would ask—

The CHAIRMAN: I was not sure myself whether Mr. Nesbitt had in mind ultimately moving the motion—and was waiting to get the minister's comments before he did—or whether he was merely wanting information. I take it that you were wanting information as to whether the minister thought that was a good way of operating the National Gallery.

Mr. NESBITT: That is exactly what I was inquiring about, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Monteith brought up the question when he said he wanted a statement in regard to the receipts of the National Gallery and the disbursements from it.

Mr. MONTEITH: The special operating account.

The CHAIRMAN: The annual report also gives the consolidated statement. The purchase account is Schedule B of that, and the special operating account, which Mr. Monteith had in mind, is Schedule C, on the last page of the report. Everything is set out in detail in the special operating account, including the receipts from the sale of reproductions, catalogues, etc., interest on $1,000 bond, donation to the Design Centre from Henry Birks & Sons Limited, and miscellaneous, and showing a total received of $29,677.49. Revenue, together with the balance on hand at the beginning of the period, totals $111,865.78. Then it shows the disbursements: purchases of works of art, etc., fees and expenses of a lecture tour, royalties and commissions. This shows that the commission on the purchase of paintings from the Liechtenstein collection is $13,632.30. This is all set out in Schedule C of the annual report. I take it that, since this is available to all members, there will be no need to bring in a statement or put it in our record.

Mr. MONTEITH: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask a question about this? First I should like to ascertain whether the $130,000 which is to be voted in item 82 goes entirely into the purchase of works of art, as in Schedule B?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, completely.

Mr. MICHENER: So it will be added to whatever balance there is as of this date.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: The balance on hand on March 31, 1954 was $110,000. Is there any vote for the operating account, Schedule C?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, the special operating account is an account in which no public moneys, I understand, are deposited.

Mr. MONTEITH: Sales by the National Gallery are included.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right. I beg your pardon. What I really meant to say was that no money is voted by parliament for that. The Gallery does, of course, get money from the sale of silk screens and other reproductions and that sort of thing. It is allowed to deposit this money in a special operating account, and in addition any benefactions are deposited in that account.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if we are getting a true picture of it. It is there, but it is not reflected in the department's statement.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is the department's statement.

Mr. MONTEITH: To get a true over-all picture of the department, you have to take the sale of these silk screens into consideration. As it is, they are not accounted for to parliament at all. They simply appear in the National Gallery statement.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is how the Act was passed before I was a member of parliament and before you were. I think it is quite good, and I am not in favour of amending it. If you think it ought to be amended, you can take the necessary steps in the House, but we cannot amend it in this committee.

Mr. MONTEITH: I should like to know of a business that could have that kind of revenue and not have it taken into consideration—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that this is rather reflecting on the intelligence of the other members of the committee who were in the parliament that passed this Act.

Mr. FULTON: Not at all. We are endeavouring to find out how it works.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the way in which it has been working has been covered in the annual reports.

Mr. FULTON: We have not had an estimates committee before.

Mr. CANNON: We have had reports which you could read.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the committee that it was thought that apparently some autonomy should be given to the board of trustees, as long as they report what they receive and what they spent, but if they have to come back to parliament for a grant to make substantial purchases then, of course, parliament does retain control over the situation. The whole financial setup is disclosed in the annual report, so that members have obviously a right to go into that as fully as they wish.

Mr. MONTEITH: I claim that the estimates, as they are laid down in this book, together with the Public Accounts, do not give a true picture for the year. In this operating account an amount is included for sale of materials which does not go in as revenue and does not come off expenditures. It just appears in the special operating account.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the same with the Canadian National Railways. From time to time they have to come to parliament for a grant, and the only way in which a grant to the Canadian National Railways appears in our estimates and public accounts is when we vote for some money to pay interest or something of the sort. We are voting money to make purchases of works of art.

Mr. MONTEITH: Nobody is voting this $29,000.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I raise a point of order quite seriously, Mr. Chairman, at this point. We are now doing what parliament said must be done in the only way in which we are allowed by law to do it. If the law should be amended or if any member of parliament thinks the law should be amended, the way to do it is to introduce a bill for that purpose. Mr. Monteith may say

that that would be a money bill and that he could not introduce it. At least he could put a resolution on the paper downstairs and have it discussed where they have the competence to discuss it. We have not the competence in this committee.

Mr. MICHENER: Does not this set up originate with the department and the minister who is in charge of it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, it is laid down by parliament.

Mr. MITCHENER: It is quite appropriate to inquire into it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not take the slightest exception to any inquiries as to how the money is used in this special account.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this $130,000 a lapsing vote if it is not spent?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, it is paid into the fund.

Mr. MICHENER: Is the spending of the money entirely within the discretion of trustees of the National Gallery once it is voted?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: It seems to me that there is a confusion between the two methods of operation: one is a departmental method in which we vote money here under item 81 for administrative expenses of the National Gallery, and on the other hand we treat the National Gallery as to some extent a separate corporation handling its own funds. It is a corporation in law, under the Act?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Section 3 (1) of the National Gallery Act states:

> The Board of Trustees constituted by chapter thirty-three of the statutes of 1913 as a body corporate under the name of the National Gallery of Canada is hereby continued as a body corporate under the name of the National Gallery of Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: As a body corporate, do they account again for item 81 as well as item 82 in their annual report?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. Of course, in addition, everything in item 81, Mr. Michener, would appear in detail in the public accounts because, in so far as the administration of the National Gallery is concerned, it is assimilated into the administration of a government department. The salaries paid to the employees, stationery, and everything of that sort, would be shown in the public accounts.

Mr. MICHENER: I have just one more question. Could we have the total money spent by the National Gallery for the purchase of Canadian art in the past fiscal year or some comparable period that brings it up to date? Do we know how much was spent on Canadian art?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In this present fiscal year that is about to end?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps you would like two years, because one year is a rather short period.

Mr. MICHENER: I should also like to know whether there is any program with respect to the money which we are now voting, if the trustees have formulated a policy with respect to the spending of that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think the committee might like to hear the director on your last point. After all, the director attends all the meetings of the board of trustees. Perhaps he can interpret their minds as to their purchasing policy —not when there is a Liechtenstein opportunity but in the ordinary course of events during the year.

Mr. FULTON: Could you give us the names of the present board of trustees?

Hon Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are in the annual report, are they not?

Mr. FULTON: What page are they on? I could not see them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that I can give them from memory. The chairman is Mr. C. P. Fell of Toronto. The other members are, starting from the east: Doctor Flemington, the principal of Mount Allison University; Mr. Cleveland Morgan, who is president of the Montreal Art Association; Mr. Jean M. Raymond of Montreal; Mr. Jean Chauvin of Montreal; Mr. John A. MacAulay of Winnipeg; Mrs. H. A. Dyde of Edmonton; and Mr. Lawren Harris of Vancouver.

Mr. MCCURRY: With regard to the policy on Canadian art, the National Gallery has considered that its essential job is to build the finest possible collection of Canadian art that is produced. The National Gallery collection of Canadian art, I think, fulfils that description. The trustees and all of us are constantly on the lookout for good Canadian art that should be purchased. Very few good things are missed, as the minister said a little earlier in the morning. But tying the National Gallery down to buying Canadian art for a certain sum would be, I think, a mistake because you cannot tell what the production of Canadian art will be at any particular time. As long as the trustees are watching it and are prepared to buy the best things, then I think the situation is protected, but I think it would be unwise to tie down the trustees to buying a certain definite proportion. I think the difficulty with some of the proposals made is illustrated by an experience of two or three years ago that made, I think, the Minister of Finance set up this purchase account for the National Gallery. There was a very fine Constable coming up at Christie's. It seemed as if it were going to go at a modest price. I consulted the trustees and the experts who knew about it and asked if they thought that it was a picture suitable for the National Gallery, and they urged that we try to get it, but we did not have the funds. Even if we had used the whole fund voted by parliament it would not have covered this purchase. We regard Constable as a very important artist to be represented in the history of painting. I consulted the minister, who consulted the Minister of Finance and asked him if he would back us up if we put in a bid which we thought would bring this picture to us—an amount of £35,000. He said that he would. But when I telephoned my bid to Christie's in London Sir Alex Martin said, "My goodness, can't you go higher than that?" I said, "No, that is all the money we have." When the sale came on, we lost the picture. It went to Sir Donald Buchanan, and it is there now. Those are the situations that arise from time to time when good things come up. You must have a try with what money you have available. That is why we like to keep a certain sum in the operating account if we can: it helps in emergencies.

Mr. NESBITT: I have one or two questions I should like to ask Doctor McCurry.

The CHAIRMAN: One of the things which you did not cover is whether you had anything in mind for the program for the coming year. Did you wish to make any comment on that?

Mr. MCCURRY: The trustees have arranged, I think, for a biennial exhibition of Canadian art in which the pictures are examined by selected committees all over this country. That exhibition will take place, and from that exhibition their purchases will be made. That is the program. Of course there are programs of continual exhibitions going on all the time—exhibitions from abroad—because it seems to me that it is essential that the National Gallery should keep Canada informed of the developments elsewhere. Otherwise we would be in a backwater and would not know what is going on.

Mr. NESBITT: Regarding the present collections of United States and Mexican art, probably Mr. McCurry would agree that both these schools—if you can call them that—have an important influence on North American art. Are there any plans or is there any opportunity to purchase some examples of modern Mexican art and United States art of the present and the past?

Mr. McCURRY: I think that is the thought of the trustees, especially with regard to American art. We have had experiences from time to time with Mexican art, but no purchases were made at the time because there were not sufficient funds. There is a continual stream of exhibitions from various countries, distributed through the National Gallery to all the rest of the country. That is one of the services that we think is most valuable to this country, the circulation of exhibitions from abroad, as well as the circulation of Canadian exhibitions to other countries.

Mr. NESBITT: In that connection, I take it that the Dutch collection which is presently being exhibited in Toronto cannot be exhibited at the National Gallery because there are no facilities?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They would not trust us in that building. They would not put those pictures in that building. That is why we want a new building—because it is shocking that we cannot have an exhibition like that in Ottawa.

Mr. CANNON: Because of the risk of fire?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The risk of fire and the general unsuitability of the building.

Mr. NESBITT: I have another question along the same lines. There might be some doubt as to whether they have more artistic or anthropological value, but has any thought been given to acquiring Canadian Eskimo carvings and so on, some of the North American Indian art done on hides and that sort of thing?

Mr. McCURRY: We have the beginning of a North American Indian collection but it is quite small yet. It could be expanded but again the question of room, you see, is a vital one. We cannot keep these things stored continually. As far as Eskimo art is concerned, while we would like to have a collection of Eskimo art, and the trustees may decide to enter the field, the work of the Eskimos is nevertheless being collected by the National Museum for the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. I think that we would be rather cautious about entering that field until we have an understanding with the National Museum as to whether we collected it or they did.

Mr. NESBITT: The school of French art from the middle of the last century on is very well represented with the exception of Matisse. Has there been any opportunity to acquire any paintings by Matisse?

Mr. McCURRY: We have made several attempts. Mr. Buchanan, who is well acquainted with Matisse's son, negotiated once or twice for a Matisse, which we have not yet received. Of course, as he has gone, we may not have the opportunity again for some time. However, we have a Matisse exhibition circulating in Canada at the present time; it has no paintings in it but it has sculpture and drawings. I think that the exhibition is at present in Montreal and making quite an impression there. It will later come to Ottawa and proceed across the country.

Mr. NESBITT: I have two more brief questions. Has any thought been given to acquiring more sculpture as well as paintings?

Mr. McCURRY: Yes, decidedly.

Mr. NESBITT: I see that Epstein is represented there, but not too much else.

Mr. McCURRY: Because of lack of accommodation the sculpture is not as commonly displayed as we would like.

Mr. NESBITT: The last question I should like to ask is with regard to the Prince of Liechtenstein's collection. I understood you earlier to say that these pictures were sent over and exhibited here so that the trustees could view them with an eye to purchasing them. The arrangements were not

final, of course, but if it seemed likely that the Prince of Liechtenstein was going to sell them to the National Gallery—I am not too familiar with some of the intricacies of art dealing—what was the purpose of employing an agent to purchase these pictures?

Mr. McCURRY: A great deal of negotiation has to be done in these matters, and the prices at which we were able to secure these through the work of Mr. Agnew were most advantageous to the National Gallery.

Mr. NESBITT: You feel that it was better to deal through an agent than to have the trustees or maybe yourself deal directly with the seller?

Mr. McCURRY: It would be much too complicated a job for anyone except an expert in that field who has the confidence of the Prince of Liechtenstein. Mr. Agnew has.

Mr. NESBITT: Surely the Prince of Liechtenstein would have a certain confidence in the trustees of the National Gallery?

Mr. McCURRY: Well, you would be surprised at the number of cables we received asking for payment.

Mr. NESBITT: I suppose that His Serene Highness looked very serene when he received the cheque.

Mr. HENRY: Could I ask how long Doctor McCurry has been in his present post as the top authority of the National Gallery?

Mr. McCURRY: Since 1939.

Mr. HENRY: Are you familiar with what is done in Australia in this connection?

Mr. McCURRY: I have never been there, but art directors from Australia have visited us and we have discussed with them what they are doing. They have a great advantage over us in that they have the famous Felton bequest from which they buy pictures continually for the gallery in Melbourne. We have no such bequest.

The CHAIRMAN: What would that bequest amount to?

Mr. McCURRY: I think, about a quarter of a million pounds.

Mr. HENRY: What about New Zealand, Mr. McCurry?

Mr. McCURRY: I do not know very much about New Zealand except that we sent them several Canadian exhibitions, but they have a series of galleries there.

Mr. HENRY: If the authorities of the galleries in the United States of America were buying pictures, would they use an agent?

Mr. McCURRY: I think they would. It would depend. For example, may I tell a secret here? We were negotiating for one of the pictures by Hans Memling that are now under discussion. There was a rival American gallery in the picture. The head of that gallery asked that the Memling be purchased for that particular institution. Our agent said, "I am already committed to the National Gallery of Canada, and I cannot do anything for you." That is the only Memling that is likely to be on sale anywhere for quite some time. I think that there was another one from the Devonshire collection, which this very wealthy centre thought it would get for this particular gallery, but, of course, that picture was sequestered by the British government and it is now national property. I am telling you these things just to show that it is a very tricky business. I think that by securing the Liechtenstein collection we did a very important thing for Canada.

Mr. HENRY: I wanted to ask Mr. McCurry to tell us how the industrial design division of the National Gallery was instituted.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if I could say a word at this point. It might facilitate matters if, before we embark on a discussion of the Industrial Design Centre, the committee agree that we finish with the National Gallery first, if there are any more questions on it. The Design Centre is really quite distinct from the National Gallery.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I have three short questions to put to Doctor McCurry. Schedule C of the annual report shows "Sales of reproductions, catalogues, etc., $29,543.68". This was mentioned by my friend across from me. It seems to me that there is a story to be told there. It seems to me that a considerable sum of money is received from the sale of catalogues and reproductions. Is that not a useful educational endeavour which you are carrying on there?

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes, the production of reproductions really occurred to us as a result of a visit to the west by me in 1921, when I discovered that all the nations were able to teach the appreciation of art from reproductions that they supplied, but there were no reproductions of Canadian paintings. When I got back we started that going, and we did produce reproductions of suitable size for teachers and a smaller post-card size for the children. They did not move very fast, because it required a great deal of education. During the war we conceived the idea of broadcasting the stories of Canadian painters—we called it "The Adventure of Canadian Painting." Beginning with Paul Kane we took about six or eight leading artists from the earlier ones right up to the present day and we sent them to all schools that wanted them, small collections of six or eight of these reproductions in colour for the children on payment of 10 cents. The demand was so great that it almost wrecked the staff. I think that a quarter of a million were sent out in the first year and later about the same number. That is the story about the reproductions. During the war we were deluged with requests from the forces for pictures to decorate their mess rooms and recreation rooms, but we had nothing but small pictures that were really quite inadequate for that purpose.

After discussing it with one of the artists there were no reproductions available in the United Kingdom because of the blitz and we had nothing here —and he said "Why do you not try the silk screen process?" I felt that these young people who were uprooted from their regular jobs were ready for new impressions and wanted pictures and ought to have what they wanted. I told Jackson that he was elected to do the first one and we would pay for it. Another artist took part in two of these very pleasant things which exactly suited the requirements of the forces and not only that but also would be of use for the schools. So, we went on with this silk screen process largely by voluntary contributions from patriotic business men and so on who had put the money, about $725, for an addition to the silk screen for the forces which would give them 300 prints large size 30 by 40 inches. That was very popular with the forces. We distributed them to all the armed forces and then sent them to our forces in the United Kingdom and as a result got a communication from the chief educational officer in the British army saying how useful these prints were and would we supply 5,000 for the British army. It was hard to find a donor to put up that amount of money but we did get it from the head of the Canadian Packers, Mr. McLean who did supply the money. Later we supplied the R.A.F. I think at government expense and they were so popular that Lady Tedder when she came out here said she would like another 500 prints.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I know that there are a great many of these prints in private homes across the country. Has any attempt, formal or informal, been made to acquire the very valuable Van Horne collection in Montreal?

Mr. MCMURRAY: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There is a very serious danger of fire there again.

Mr. McMURRAY: The Van Horne collection is now distributed between the Art Gallery of Montreal and the Van Horne heirs.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What about overseas scholarships? Have any arrangements been made or is there the possibility of Canadian artists or Canadian art students obtaining overseas scholarships?

Mr. McCURRY: I think that is a matter of government policy. Do you mean using the credits that exist over there?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: No. I am thinking of the giving of encouragement to Canadian art students.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Out of the funds of the gallery?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think that has ever been considered. There are some arrangements where scholars could get these funds provided in France, Holland and Italy; certainly in France and in Holland. I do not know if the Italian scheme went through.

Mr. FULTON: Is Mr. McCurry in a position to tell us—I am not sure if it comes under these estimates—whether the statue of Sir Robert Borden was commissioned by the National Gallery?

Mr. McCURRY: No. It was commissioned by the Department of Public Works I think.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think this is a question which I should answer. In one capacity or another I have had something to do with it from the start. The board of trustees of the National Gallery were asked to hold a competition for a suitable design and when they held the competition they selected a jury and the jury rated the various designs and finally picked one that they thought would be most suitable. From that point that project has passed to the Department of Public Works which, I understand, is in the process of making a deal with Miss Loring who was the winner of the competition.

Mr. FULTON: Are we being asked in the estimates of the gallery anything for that purpose, prize money or anything?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We did provide the prize money I understand this year. Mr. Brennan informs me that was paid from vote 404 of the Department of Public Works. The matter did come to my attention the other day as to whether it was paid out of our funds or out of theirs and we were seeking the view of the comptroller of the treasury as to which of us had the right to pay it.

Mr. FULTON: What I was wondering is was this done in the normal work of the gallery in connection with sculpture or a task assigned to them by some other department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was assigned by the government. It comes within no department at all. It was a decision made by the government, and then the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was asked by the government to request the board of trustees to do this as a special task.

Mr. FULTON: I have no knowledge of this as an expert or in any other capacity because I am not expert and I have not even seen the statue, but as a result of the controversy in the press which there has been—I do not know the merits or demerits of it—it occurred to me that this might be a very useful opportunity if Mr. McCurry wishes to say anything because he might enlighten us whether we are going to get something of a horror or a statue which does justice to Sir Robert Borden. There is a lot of concern about this.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If Mr. McCurry wishes to say something I am not going to stop him from saying it, but every precaution was taken by the government to see that any person who could provide any assistance was

given an opportunity. For example, arrangements were made to have Sir Robert Borden's secretary, who is still in Ottawa, look at the designs and make certain suggestions about improving the actual likeness. In addition to the jury there were quite a number of people who are particularly interested—I do not think this is a breach of confidence—including Mr. Grattan O'leary who has taken a good deal of interest from the start, who looked at the designs. Most of the amateurs—there were several ministers who looked at the design—were in agreement with the jury that the best design had been selected.

Mr. FULTON: Would Mr. McCurry care to say whether it is really a good design.

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes. I think it is quite a good design. I think the controversy arose mainly because one competitor was a little jealous of the award. The jury, in examining these things, thought that they could judge the two competitors that were highest if they would do their designs in a model twice the size. So they asked them to do that and of course our friend in Montreal seemed to think that meant he had the job; but, it was only a request to allow the jury to look at it again. He took too much for granted I think, but, I believe he understands the situation now. That really was the genesis of all the fuss.

Mr. FULTON: You are satisfied that the production is going to be a good one and artistic?

Mr. MCCURRY: Yes, I am sure.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, I think the members of the committee from Toronto at least are very familiar with Miss Loring's work and she is certainly one of the best sculptors in Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: I quite agree with that.

Mr. CANNON: May I ask a question on this matter of the chap in Montreal. I have read the newspapers and as I recall it I think that he asked to be reimbursed for the amount he had to spend on making this double sized design.

Mr. MCCURRY: That was done. He got an extra amount for that; twice what he would otherwise have got.

Mr. HENRY: I was going to ask if we could have the names of the members of the jury who made the decision.

Mr. MCCURRY: The only member of the Sculptor's Society who was not a competitor was named on the jury; it was Miss Sylvia Daoust, R.C.A. We thought that as architectural consideration had to be thought of that we would suggest an architect, and we suggested the name of John Bland, head of the McGill Department of Architecture and to get an outsider we took W. G. Constable, head of the Department of Painting of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Those recommendations were accepted by the then minister.

Mr. HENRY: I do not suppose you have a list of the witnesses whom they may have consulted as to the designs?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They looked at the designs themselves.

Mr. HENRY: Mr. Gratton O'Leary was apparently consulted.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not by the jury. He was asked to go and see the models in a quite informal way. The Prime Minister went to see the original models and so did Mr. Drew. Actually Mr. Drew was on the point of going to see the double sized ones from the two competitors when he became ill and was not able to do it. The arrangements had all been made. Had he not become ill he would have gone that week. We were very sorry that he was not able to go and the visit was all arranged.

Mr. MICHENER: Do you know whether Mr. Henry Borden was called?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think Mr. Henry Borden saw the whole collection. He was not able to come to see the double ones because he was leaving the

country and he asked to have Sir Robert's secretary come to look at them and said she would be able to give at least as much information as he could about the likeness.

The CHAIRMAN: There was one question in regard to what Mr. Monteith asked. In schedule B it shows disbursements, purchases of works of art, $653,904.85. That is one item there. And then in schedule C there is purchases, works of art, $29,959.79. I take it this item in schedule C would be the same sort of thing as you have receipts for of almost the same amounts, in other words, this would be small reproductions and so on.

Mr. MCCURRY: I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN: What you would be interested in, Mr. Monteith, would be an itemized statement making up the $653,000?

Mr. MONTEITH: I do not think I asked for that information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MICHENER: I was asking about the proportion of purchases from abroad and at home.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. The proportion of the amount spent on Canadian paintings and on works from abroad.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that you do not want a detailed statement on this. I wanted to be sure on that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think there will be the slightest difficulty getting what Mr. Michener wishes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this item of administration?

Mr. HENRY: I would like to have Mr. McCurry give us some details on this industrial design.

Mr. MICHENER: It will be interesting to hear about this design centre.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Incidentally I would like to extend an invitation to all the members of the committee and to anyone they would like to bring along to come to this year's prize giving. I think it is at 8.00 o'clock next Monday. I have been asked to make a speech but I promise it will be very brief indeed. The Minister of Trade and Commerce who is very interested in this work is going to make the awards.

Mr. MICHENER: At the design centre?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. It is where we hope the new gallery is to be located.

Mr. HENRY: I just want Mr. Buchanan to explain the purpose of this institution and what it has done to date.

Mr. Donald BUCHANAN (Chief, Industrial Design Division): I will give a brief explanation, but as it is all in print in the report we presented two years ago instead of going into all the early history in great detail I would like to circularize this and then I will summarize it briefly.

This work all arose out of the problems of postwar reconstruction in Canada. At the time I was connected with the National Film Board of Canada in charge of the exhibits division there and we received requests to make some study as to whether an exhibition could be prepared on what industrial design was and what good work designers did for industry. Finally the plans were formulated by the Department of Reconstruction, the National Research Council, the National Film Board and the National Gallery of Canada and they found enough money to hold a very large travelling exhibition on industrial design which went to ten cities in Canada with the sole purpose behind the exhibition of arousing both manufacturers and retailers and the public to an awareness of how designers worked in industry and how they could be used to improve the usefulness and efficiency of industrial objects.

Mr. HENRY: Do you feel in a broad way it has been helpful to industry in Canada and well received?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Yes. Industry expressed an interest in that exhibition and they began to send in requests for more information here and so an inter-departmental committee met to find out how to keep such information services going. It was for the benefit of industry. The only Act which gave any jurisdiction over industrial design and encouragement of industrial design was the National Gallery of Canada Act which had always had a clause in it to that effect as well as a clause on appreciation of fine arts, and they considered it ought to be established under the National Gallery's Board of Trustees. That is how the industrial design division of the National Gallery was set up. You can of course see by glancing over the headings of that report which I have passed to each of you that there has been a multitude of activity in cooperation with industry.

Mr. HENRY: How many prizes will be given at the coming prize giving event?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Those are not actually prizes in the normal sense. Those are awards in the form of the right to use a "good design" label. It means that the product which receives the award has been judged as an outstanding design in its category during the year on the basis of form and function. That is done by rating committees and then checked finally by a national jury which met about a month ago here. It is used widely now by the manufacturers who received it and they buy literally several hundred thousands of tags and labels at cost price from us and use them on the products which receive the awards. It is done with two intentions: one is to make manufacturers more competitive in the field of trying to obtain better design and use Canadian designers; and the second is, through the manufacturers using the word "good design" on products which are so adjudicated, to bring good design to the attention of the public so more and more consumers will begin to think in terms of whether a product is well designed or not.

Mr. HENRY: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on that?

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask whether the service is entirely free to industry?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Certain services are. We answer all normal enquiries from manufacturers and supply them with photographs we have of the work of our Canadian designers free of charge. But if they want some extraordinary service then they pay for it. For example, Courtaulds (Canada) Ltd. was very anxious that that part of the textile industry with which they are associated in the sale of their synthetic yarn should take a greater interest in design. In fact they were very worried about one reason for difficulties in the textile industry in Canada, which is simply that not enough attention is being paid to design; even in a new field like synthetic yarns if the companies did not pay attention to design they could not meet competition because imported fabrics were coming from countries where there were very old and established design movements. They wanted to encourage design through awarding prizes in textile designs in synthetic yarns. They asked us whether we could hold a competition for them. We did it and it is a very good promotional project and they are paying into the design centre all the costs of holding such a competition which is being held in the name of the National Industrial Design Council. All prizes, all printing, all publicity costs or secretarial costs involved will be paid by Courtaulds' when the competition is finished.

Mr. MICHENER: Looking at the designer's part in this is there any way you can indicate to the committee what stimulation has been given to industrial design by the activities of your office or branch?

Mr. BUCHANAN: It is the type of activity that unless you are really in the field you do not see any mass result, but if you are working in the field you see dozens of growing points of development. For example, we have been giving scholarships for advanced training in industrial design because there is no advanced training in this country. We have given 16, over a five-year period, and when those students who are mainly engineering students and architectural students took this advanced training in the United States or England and came back here, the first group were not able to get really straightforward design jobs in industry; they got architectural jobs again or engineering jobs, and we were wondering if we were not too advanced in encouraging this work when industry was not prepared to use designers. That was only in the first two years. In the last two years these scholarship students suddenly found there was a demand for their services and they are being employed as designers. One in fact has already started his own firm as a consultant designer, which is one criterion of the success of the project. Another one is this: when we first established a record of Canadian designs based on international standards we had a selection committee follow a rule that they would not record anything in our index for archives and publication purposes unless it came up to international standards. They only managed to find about 20 Canadian products the first year that they could so record, but it has gone up year by year until this last year they added about 150 items in one year to the Canadian Design Index.

Mr. MICHENER: There is one more aspect which is of principal interest in designing, the royalty that comes to a designer for the use of his design. Does your office take any part in that or is that entirely left to the usual law of trade marks and design?

Mr. BUCHANAN: No. We do not, except that the National Industrial Design Council did appoint a sub-committee to study the workings of the present industrial design legislation in Canada and that sub-committee prepared a brief and appeared before the present Royal Commission on the subject.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the industrial design division which was set up as it was two years ago, I think in the 1954-55 estimates is the first time it appears as a separate department, there were 6 employees there for the 1954-55 year and there are 8 in the estimates for the 1955-56 year. I am just wondering if there is any idea in the back of the mind of the minister as to how far he proposes to develop this division?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think in the first place the real addition is only one. Formerly we employed a commissionaire. He was not on the strength of department, but he was paid out of the vote for special services or whatever it is called. Now, instead they have a receptionist who is on the payroll of the Industrial Design Centre because she can perform functions which the commissionaire could not perform. There has been, I believe, need for one extra clerk.

Mr. FULTON: I notice detailed in last year's estimates you paid $100 for rent, and this year $1,500 for rental of buildings. Does that represent a change in your present quarters or is that because you are going to rent more space in industrial design fairs.

Mr. BUCHANAN: That is merely a bookkeeping change within the government departments themselves. With regard to the National Design Council awards, the policy is not only to show them at a design exhibition here but also to have the same exhibition at the Canadian International Trade Fair at Toronto. Last year, when it was first done, the Department of Trade and Commerce was so much interested in encouraging this that, as we had not made allowance in our estimates for the rental of space at the International Trade Fair, the Department of Trade and Commerce rented the space for us.

That was an extraordinary measure, which would not normally happen; so this year the rental of space in the International Trade Fair is in our estimates.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Buchanan, I suppose that, besides cooperating with various government departments, you cooperate with business generally?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Do you have anything to do with the Canadian exhibition committee, the people responsible for foreign exhibitions?

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Canadian Government Exhibition Commission?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Commission, or whatever it is.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Do you give them advice?

Mr. BUCHANAN: We use their services when we require exhibition construction services. Also, the Design Centre and the Canadian Government Exhibition Commission jointly designed and presented an international "good" design exhibition of Canadian designs at the X Triennale, Milan, last autumn.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I am sure that you helped them considerably. As an aside, I assume that the Post Office did not consult you on the designs of their stamps. As a serious question, though, is there an industrial design school at present or is any contemplated, or what is your thinking along those lines?

Mr. BUCHANAN: The only school is a section of the Ontario College of Art, which is not at university level. The National Industrial Design Council has gone on record with resolutions that it favours industrial design training on the same level as that of engineers and architects at universities, but no university as yet has gone into it.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: The demand is not great enough yet?

Mr. BUCHANAN: We are not certain of that. The estimates show that it costs about $100,000 to set up a workshop for this kind of training, and no university, unless it is endowed for that purpose, is at the moment likely to institute an industrial design course.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I know that there are several individual private industrial design firms in operation, some good and some bad, but there is no general over-all association?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Yes, there is the Association of Canadian Industrial Designers, which has a charter from the Secretary of State of Canada. It has 30 members. It is trying to establish what are recognized standards for the profession.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we count items 81, 82 and 83 as carried?

Carried.

The committee will meet again on Thursday at 3.30 p.m. in this room.

The committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 9

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer, and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

54910—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

TUESDAY, March 8, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Dinsdale be substituted for that of Mr. Nesbitt on the said Committee.

Attest.

Leon J. Raymond,
Clerk of the House.

54910—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 10, 1955.
(10)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Pickersgill, Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Col. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration; the Minister and his officials answered questions and supplied information thereon.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Monteith,—

That the Committee hear John R. Taylor, Barrister, of Vancouver, on the subject of his study of the administration of the Immigration Act.

A similar motion regarding the hearing of Mr. John H. McDonald, Barrister, of Ottawa, was also filed by Mr. Fulton.

Following discussion, the Chairman deferred his ruling until the next meeting.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Monteith,—

That in the opinion of this Committee it is not desirable that Ministers of Departments whose estimates are before the Committee for investigation and study should be members of the Committee during the period of such study of their own department, and that the Committee recommend to the House accordingly.

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division: Yeas: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Dinsdale, Fulton, Michener, Monteith, Starr, Thatcher, and Yuill.—(8).

Nays: Messrs. Benidickson, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Pickersgill, and Stuart (*Charlotte*).—(13).

Mr. Pickersgill supplied information, requested at a previous meeting relating to The National Gallery of Canada. (*See Appendix "C" to this day's Evidence*).

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Friday, March 11.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MARCH 10, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. We shall start the meeting. Before we actually get down to business, I hope the committee will bear with the chairman in regard to his actions in trying to arrange these meetings. I understood that the Canadian Legion wished to make a presentation on veterans' affairs. There are quite a number of members on both the Veterans' Affairs committee and on this committee, and I thought they would want to be here in the morning, and so I had called this committee for tomorrow afternoon.

That did not suit a couple of our members, so I asked them to bear with the situation because the Canadian Legion wanted to come on Friday. I find now they can only get here for the afternoon, which means we can switch back to the morning and satisfy the members who did not like the proposal to meet on Friday afternoon. We shall of course conflict with the external affairs committee, but I see they are going ahead holding two meetings a day and must realize that it will conflict with other committees, so I think we shall just have to accept that situation and go ahead with our meeting. So if it is satisfactory, what I have in mind gentlemen is that we should meet tomorrow morning at 10.30, on Monday at 3.30, on Tuesday at 10.30, on Wednesday at 3.30, on Thursday at 3.30 and on Friday at 10.30. Members will note we are having half of these meetings in the morning and half in the afternoon to give a 50-50 break to the other committees. Unless something unforeseen happens, then, we shall hold the meetings of this committee at those times.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You did not consult me about this, Mr. Chairman, but you could not have arranged a schedule which would have suited me better because you seem to have left out the mornings when it is most difficult for me to be here.

The CHAIRMAN: We must be in rapport, then.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It must have been telepathy. Anyway I am very pleased.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope what I have done will suit the rest of the committee as well. We shall meet tomorrow at 10.30 unless something else happens. I believe you had a question, Mr. Macnaughton.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I was wondering whether the hon. minister would explain what categories of Chinese are admissible at the present time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman. My experience as minister is that there are perhaps as many Chinese cases which come to my attention as all other cases combined, and I have been very concerned about this fact. As we all recognize, China is not one of the major sources of immigration to Canada, and it did seem to me that there was something disproportionate about the member of these cases which were coming to me. It is only the problem cases which I have to deal with, and I directed some time ago that a review should be made of all the existing Chinese cases. I use the word "Chinese" but I think everybody knows what I mean by it, and I hope no one will quibble about semantics.

As I said I directed that a review be made of all the Chinese cases still pending to see if there was any way in which this problem could be simplified. Under the regulations it is very simple, or seems to be very simple. Under the Immigration regulations the only persons of Chinese origin who are admissible to Canada as immigrants, if they comply in other respects with the requirements of the Act and regulations are: the wife, the husband or the unmarried children under 21 years of age of any Canadian citizen resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents. You may see from this that there are a great many qualifications attached to admission and that is where one of the administrative problems has arisen. These regulations have not been changed since December 28, 1950, at which time the age of admissible children was raised from under 18 to under 21, and husbands were placed on a basis of equality with wives.

Mr. CAMERON (Nanaimo): May I just say this—what the hon. minister says is intriguing—

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better, I think to let the minister finish.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As members of this committee who were members of the last parliament will remember, on June 28, 1951, my predecessor, Mr. Harris, stated that the regulations had been applied rigidly up to that time, even though this involved in some cases—and here I am using his actual words—"real hardship and perhaps suffering." That situation Mr. Harris did not find satisfactory and, on that day, he stated in the House of Commons, as reported in the unrevised Hansard for June 28, 1951, at page 4863 that:

> Having in mind the present situation in China and the known desire of parents to have their children with them, we have come to the conclusion that we will give consideration to those cases of unmarried children over 21 up to the age of 25, to see if the circumstances warrant their admission on the grounds I have stated." That is, grounds of "real hardship and perhaps suffering".

The regulations were not changed, however. The admission of these unmarried children over 21 was in each individual case decided on its merits, and from time to time recommendations were made to the Governor in Council to admit these cases where there was real hardship, despite the regulations. They were inadmissible under the regulations, but what really happened was that in each individual case an order in council was passed. An order in council is in itself, of course, a regulation, but it applied in these circumstances only to one individual case.

The reason for taking the action in 1951 was, I understand, that many children between the ages of 18 and 21 would have been admitted if the age limit had been fixed at 21 in 1947, but all such persons would, of course, now be beyond the age of 25. Meanwhile nearly 8 years have passed since the Chinese Immigration Act was repealed, and as a consequence this whole problem of the backlog has really been overcome. In fact, since July 1951, the Immigration branch have accepted applications for unmarried children over 21 years of age and under 25, and the Governor in Council has approved waiving the regulations for more than 2,300 persons coming within that group.

Members of the committe will see that a quite considerable number of people within that group has been admitted outside the ordinary regulations which apply to countries other than China. With the passage of time, that particular problem has been met, and from now on it is proposed to adhere to the regulations in Chinese cases just as we do in the case of persons of other Asian origin.

Of course I would not want this to be misunderstood. It means that from now on further applications from persons over 21 will not be entertained, but all existing applications before the department will be dealt with in accordance with Mr. Harris' statement of 1951, and I will recommend to my colleagues all existing applications for unmarried children under 25 which I can conscientiously regard as cases of real hardship which merit exemption from the regulations. This is what Mr. Harris did before me.

I hope I have made it quite clear that this group of people are not covered by the regulations and that the general law has never applied to them. They have all been considered as individual cases on merit and I intend to deal with all the cases which are still before the department on that basis. This exceptional procedure seems now to have served its purpose, but there are other exceptional cases which I think merit consideration, and I might mention them now. As I said at the beginning of this answer, all the existing applications for the admission of persons of Chinese origin have been reviewed in the past few months, and I might say a word about that review. I think I said in the House of Commons in the debate that the number of persons of the Chinese race admitted to Canada between the first of May, 1947 and the 31st of December, 1954 is 11,558. In the same time about 1,200 applications were rejected, that is to say there was about one rejection in ten applications.

After the recent review of these rejections I have come to the conclusion that in those cases where a rejection was made solely on the ground that there was a discrepancy in age, I am prepared to give the benefit of the doubt to the prospective immigrant if the X-ray examination shows that the age variation was within four years of the age indicated on the application. That will apply of course to unmarried children whose claimed age is under 21. It does seem to me that some drastic step has got to be taken to dispose of these cases, and that seems a pretty reasonable attitude to take. I may say with regard to these X-rays, that they are not the only tests, and if the officials at Hong Kong are satisfied that the case is an obvious one for admission without taking X-rays, then no X-rays are taken. X-rays are only taken where doubt exists as to the real age.

I am now proposing to give the benefit of the doubt in every case where the discrepancy is four years or less, and where there is only an age discrepancy and nothing else. There are some cases, unfortunately, where we do not believe that the person in question is the child of the sponsor.

As for those whose claimed age is over 21 and under 25, I have received the general approval of my colleagues for the relaxation of the regulations by order in council of a number of similar cases, and I intend to proceed immediately with the submission in those cases. There are about 100 cases which I am satisfied to have proceeded with, a very considerable proportion of the whole number.

I have also received approval from my colleagues—and this is a new departure—in the case of 16 applications for permanent admission to Canada of Chinese who came here as students and who have parents in Canada. You might ask why they do not come under the regulations. They do not come under the regulations either because they are married or because they are over 21 years of age and in some cases over 25. But they are people who have been in Canada, some of them, for quite a number of years. They are all cases of people who, I think, everyone in the committee would really feel ought to be allowed to stay in Canada. They have had their education here, they fell like Canadians, and they are mostly people who are occupying positions of some real social value in the community. I decided to take up this matter with my colleagues, and I found that they approved very readily of having this done. Including dependents, this group numbers 23 persons.

Then, in addition to that, there are 40 applications by students who have completed their studies and are here on a temporary status. These are students who have no parents in Canada, though some may have other relatives. There are also 12 businessmen, three cooks, six typesetters, two engineers and two teachers. With dependents, the total number of persons involved in this group is 109.

I may say that in the case of the occupational groups that I have mentioned, they are all employed where it would be very hard to dispense with them. For instance, if we are going to have Chinese newspapers in this country, it is not very easy to find Chinese typesetters in a National Employment Service office, even if there is some employment.

Many of these students have had very distinguished records in various Canadian universities. They have been allowed to stay here under the discretion given to the minister, without being landed. They do not know what their future is. I really hope that the whole committee will approve what the government has decided to do in this case in allowing these people who cannot comply with the ordinary regulations to be landed as immigrants, if, of course, they can meet the medical examination and the other normal formalities—and I have no doubt that most of them can. As soon as formal action has been taken by the Governor in Council, the persons concerned and their relatives and those persons who have written on their behalf will be notified. I suppose that it would be too much to hope that interested persons will not begin writing in immediately to see if they are on the list, before they are notified, but if members of parliament will exercise a little forbearance for a few days it will help us to get the job of notification done a little faster.

Mr. MONTEITH: I should just like to ask the minister this. In those cases that have been pending and about which members have corresponded with your department, do you intend to let the members know?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall let the member know first of all, unless some accident happens. If it turns out that one letter gets to somebody else before it gets to the member, I hope that a little reasonable spirit of forgiveness will be shown. We shall try to let the members who have interested themselves in these cases know just as soon as it is humanly possible. I believe that the action I have announced here—and I received approval for it only the day before yesterday or I would have taken the committee into my confidence earlier—will dispose of almost all the cases now before the department of persons of Chinese origin, or at least the applications which have real merit, and that it will be welcomed, as I hope it will be, not only by the Canadian Chinese community but by all Canadians in general.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask, Mr. Minister, about the cases where people have gone beyond the age of 25 while the question of their age has been argued about.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If they have the same kind of merit, they will certainly be treated in the same way.

Mr. STARR: If an application was made on behalf of a Chinese immigrant, and he was at the age of 23, in this case—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the question that the chairman has just asked. He will not be out if he satisfies all the other qualifications I have mentioned. I should regard that as a case of real merit. Some of these cases are all ready for recommendation to the Governor in Council on that basis already.

Mr. STARR: Is the procedure of screening applied to a proposed Chinese immigrant the same as that applied in Europe?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do our best, Mr. Starr. I think I should repeat again what I said in the House. I noticed that it was suggested by a newspaper columnist that what I said in the House was said for the purpose of confusing the members of the opposition. Well, I have no such thought. I do not want to confuse anybody. This whole business is confusing enough without trying to add any kind of unnecessary confusion to it. I think that it cannot escape the mind of any person who looks at this question objectively that it is a quite remarkable thing we have done, while the fighting was going on in Korea in which the present defacto administration in Peking was certainly conniving at what was being done in Korea—I am trying to understate this as much as I can. If it had been a European country I do not believe for one minute that we would have let a single immigrant except a bona fide refugee from such a country in here under our immigration laws while troops from that country were fighting ours. But during that whole period we let in a good many hundreds, indeed possibly two or three thousand of these Chinese. Now, I think it says a good deal for the forbearance and good sense of the Canadian people that that was possible, but do not let us pretend that it was without risks.

I thiink that every member of the committee agrees wih me that Mr. Blair Fraser is an honourable, upright and honest correspondent. No doubt you have all read the article that he wrote about his visit to our office in Hong Kong. I think that it does reveal clearly how easy it would be to use our immigration in an attempt to infiltrate agents into North America. As members of the committee know, the United States has taken a very different position from the position that we have taken. That is why I say "North America" rather than "Canada". I think there is no doubt about it that—if I might put it this way—about the most dangerous age is the age between 18 and 25. That is why in many of these cases where we seem to have been pedantic in the administration of this department, where we seem to have insisted perhaps overmuch on making sure that the person who claimed that he was the father really was the father. As you know, vital statistics do not exist in China, and the problem was vastly complicated from that point of view. And, of course, we could not get any kind of real security information out of China to assist in any marked degree in the screening. We have, I admit, taken precautions in some of these cases that have seemed to many members of parliament to be quite beyond reason, but surely it must be evident that neither Mr. Harris nor I are such poor politicians that we want to lose friends and lose support by annoying Canadian citizens through delaying these applications. If we do delay them, it is for one reason only, and that is that we think we have a duty to carry out, as conscientiously as we can, this obligation to safeguard the security of the country that has been placed upon us.

Mr. STARR: Mr. Chairman, from the remarks of the minister, I would say that the government has been practising two policies. With respect to Chinese immigration leiency has been afforded in the screening, as compared with that applied to immigrants coming from countries behind the iron curtain.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You recognize that in so far as they could get out, exactly the same categories were admitted from countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. STARR: But they get the screening.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They do not get any more screening than Chinese. In fact, it is so much easier in European cases to establish the basic facts about the relationship, because in all the countries behind the iron curtain there are good vital statistics. Another point is this: where the parents are here, they are nearly always both here, and not just one. That has been another complication. That goes back to the old Chinese Immigration Act. The fathers were

here, and in many cases the mothers were not. That has vastly affected Chinese immigration. The real difficulty in Europe is that, whereas the Chinese have been able to get out of China, it is very difficult to get out of countries behind the iron curtain in Europe. But exactly the same regulation applies, except that I am not sure—the deputy will correct me if I am wrong?—but I think that in the case of countries behind the iron curtain in Europe we allow legally landed residents of Canada to apply for their children. They do not have to be citizens before they can do so. That is a difference.

I apologize to the committee for going into this at such length, but it did seem to me, as this represented something that I was not able to say in the debate in the House because it has been brought to a conclusion since, that I ought to tell the committee about it at the first opportunity, so that it would be part of the information that would be available and on which the department could be examined.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, if that is concluded, for the time being I should like to go back to the discussion that we had at the last sitting of the committee on the subject of immigration, when you will recall that we were discussing the method of processing applications for admission to Canada. That arose out of information given us by Mr. Couture, the legal officer of the Depart of Justice, regarding the cases which had been before the courts in Montreal, as a result of improper actions on the part of Immigration Officers. I think that this raises again the whole question of the administration of the Immigration Act. Now, I want to make it very clear that there is a comparatively small absolute number of immigration officers involved, but I express the feeling that to some extent the possibility of this sort of thing that has happened in Montreal is facilitated by what the minister regards as necessary secrecy—I regard it as unnecessary—surrounding the refusal of admissions to Canada. In my view, it does indicate the necessity of a good look at the administrative practices in the department in dealing with these applications.

Therefore, at the risk of repeating suggestions previously made, I am going to suggest again that the committee should give itself the benefit of hearing from people who have made a two-year study of this matter. Accordingly I move, seconded by Mr. Monteith,

That the committee hear John R. Taylor, barrister, of Vancouver, on the subject of his study of the administration of the Immigration Act.

I have another separate motion that we hear John H. McDonald, barrister, of Ottawa. Perhaps they could be dealt with together.

I expect, Mr. Chairman, that somebody will say that this is a subject that we have already decided.

An Hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Mr. FULTON: I point out, in that regard, that it is not the same motion as previously submitted and ruled out of order. That was a motion that the committee call or summons these witnesses. What I am suggesting now is that the committee take advantage of the possibility, or rather, of the fact in Mr. Taylor's case, that he has indicated that he is prepared to come before the committee at any time that the committee would like him to do so. If this motion is adopted,we would not be summoning a witness in the sense of sending him a summons from the committee; we would be hearing witnesses on a voluntary basis.

I would point out to the committee that there is authority for this in May, page 599, as follows:

> "When the object, or one of the objects, of a select committee has been the investigation of facts, committees have, without any express authority for that purpose, examined all witnesses who voluntarily appeared before them."

So my motion is now phrased in such a way that we are saying that since they will appear voluntarily, we should hear them.

The CHAIRMAN: What volume of May is that?

Mr. FULTON: The 15th Edition Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, while you are looking at that, could I say a word? I might save a great deal of the time of the committe and enable the committee to make a much better decision about the motions raised by Mr. Fulton by saying that the last time this subject was brought up in the committee I was asked by one member the question as to who had signed the two documents in my deputy's possession which appeared to be the same as two of the documents referred to in Mr. Taylor's letter to Mr. Fulton. I examined the mimeographed documents which I have. They bear no signature, of course, but typed at the bottom of both these documents is the name of Mr. Taylor and of Mr. Taylor only.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I think I asked you that question for the purpose of seeing how authentic these documents were.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I cannot vouch for that, but I am willing to say this right now, that Mr. Taylor put these documents into the possession of my deputy minister under certain conditions, which both the deputy and I thought we understood, and which Mr. Taylor confirmed in writing to me in a letter which has been placed on the record of this committee. Then Mr. Taylor saw fit to write to Mr. Fulton, without doing me the courtesy of bothering to write to me, saying he was now prepared to have me take a different course. If Mr. Taylor wants to write to me direct and tell me he takes personal responsibility for these documents which bear his name only I will lay them before the committee just as soon as I get Mr. Taylor's letter, and then the committee will have a chance to say whether the stuff in these documents give Mr. Taylor any particular title to appear as an expert in this matter. And if he wants to send me the two documents which I have not seen and which my deputy minister has not got in his possession I will be prepared to lay them on the table without even looking them over. I do not think, therefore, that, we need to detain the committee for long on the subject of Mr. Fulton's motion.

Mr MACNAUGHTON: I understand Mr. Taylor will be submitting documents for which he himself takes responsibility, and they have no direct or indirect connection with the Canadian bar. I suppose anyone in Canada could send documents to the committee if he wanted to, but it is another thing to pretend you are presenting the case of the Canadian Bar Association.

Mr. FULTON: I would point out that the motion does not relate to documents. I had no desire to be repetitious, and that is why I did not refer to the documents. That was decided at the last meeting, but one, of this committee. This is a motion which enables the committee to hear the evidence of Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald if they will come, and I refer to Mr. Taylor's letter which is on the record and in which he said, referring to this Committee: "...I should be glad to appear at any time before such a Committee and to discuss with them the basis upon which I carried on my investigation, its extent, and my own conclusions."

I am suggesting that since he wants to come, he should be invited, and I imagine he would then certainly bring with him the documents referred to, and Mr. Macnaughton could then satisfy his obviously great curiosity on whether he is prepared to take responsibility for them. I maintain that the most satisfactory thing would be to have here the persons who wrote the documents. Their direct evidence is even better than that of the documents which they have prepared.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: On that particular point, it has been stressed on several occasions that Mr. Taylor spent two years engaged in what has been described as an exhaustive study of this department. I have here with me officials who have worked for many years in the administration of this department, and I do not think I have shown the slightest hesitation, since I came here and brought these officials here, about answering any reasonable question at all. The administration practices of these officials have been called into question on the basis of documents which most of the members of the committee have never seen. I have now suggested a means by which, if Mr. Taylor wants to demonstrate the results of his investigation, all the members of the committee can see and judge for themselves whether he is a witness worthy of taking up the time of the committee. It does seem to me that having made that offer—and his name is the only name at the bottom of those documents—if he will write a letter to me and say I can publish the two documents which have a date in July, I will put them on the table when we meet tomorrow morning at 10.30. If I get a letter at 10.29 and if he sends me the other two documents, and they arrive at 10.29. I will not even look at them, I will put them on the table and let those who are here see what Mr. Taylor has to say.

Mr. FULTON: Why is the hon. minister so shy about Mr. Taylor coming before the committee?

Hon. MEMBER: We have no time to lose.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not know if this matter is open for discussion. In the meantime the minister is selling a bill of goods to the committee and we do not know quite where we stand. It is perhaps too much to hope that the committee will be uninfluenced by what the hon. minister says, but I think we should know whether we are debating this matter now.

The CHAIRMAN: I recall I asked Mr. McLeod to withdraw his motion which sought to put the committee on record that we felt that these documents should in some way be made available to us. I would not be a bit surprised if that did not seem to the committee to be very reasonable—that on the part of the committee there should be a desire to have a look at hese documents. Certainly I do, and that was why I was so anxious to have them tabled in the House. No doubt it is in the minds of the committee that they ought to have a look at these documents if they can get them properly; and when Mr. McLeod withdrew that motion, he withdrew it I think, because it was complicating the situation. Then we went on to something else. I was not sure at the time whether the motion was in order or not, but I think it did express the feeling of a lot of members of the committee. I would not be a bit surprised from what the minister says if he feels the same way, and that he would like the committee and the country see these documents if they could be properly brought before us; I think he made a very good suggestion with regard to that matter. In other words if the man who signed the document is willing to indicate to us that it is in order for the minister to lay them before the committee, we will have the chance to look at the documents.

In regard to the motion of Mr. Fulton, I find nothing in Bourinot on it, and in May, which Mr. Fulton has cited at page 599, it states this:

> Modes of obtaining or compelling the attendance of witnesses or the production of documents. Generally: a select committee cannot require the attendance of witnesses or the production of documents without express authority from the House.

And then it goes on to say that other committees, however, have regarded their powers of inquiry as restricted to powers specifically named on their

appointment, and that reference is to the select committee on the civil list in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom.

So it is a question I suppose, strictly speaking, whether the committee was set up to investigate facts, in which event it goes without saying they can examine any witnesses to gain evidence about those facts, or whether we were set up to do something else. And strictly speaking I think, as everybody knows, that we were set up to examine these estimates, not to go into any facts of a particular matter.

Mr. MONTEITH: The estimates are not facts Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: They are indeed hard facts. They involve the expenditure of money. But we are given the same powers in effect as the House of Commons which has no right to examine witnesses. Yet if this committee is a success it will go on in the years ahead and I do not want to make any rulings which might in any way hamper it in the years to come, so I would like to look into this motion further.

There is another aspect about which I am doubtful. If the committee has no power to send for witnesses to come here, but agree to hear witnesses who voluntarily appear we would be exposing ourselves to a certain situation. If, for example, there was some organized movement to establish certain facts before the committee the representatives of that movement could arrange to have witnesses here, and members could ask them to give evidence if they wished, but afterwards the committee would have no power to send for other witnesses to answer the witnesses who had appeared. In other words the committee would be surrendering control over its own proceedings to the extent that it would be dependent on whether witnesses were willing to appear or not, and I do not myself think that is the idea behind the rule. I think sending for witnesses means not necessarily sending outside this building or outside this room, but that the chairman, acting on your behalf has power to send for witnesses to come before you and give evidence. Even if a man is present in this room, before he can give evidence, I have to send for him before he can appear and give evidence.

Therefore, I think that strictly speaking the motion is out of order. We are again being asked to send for a witness; even though he is willing to come into this room, I would still have to summon him here to the table as to the witness box before he could give evidence. So I really think this motion is out of order. But I do suggest that Mr. Fulton who is apparently in touch with Mr. Taylor—and if he is not in touch with him, then maybe Mr. Taylor will have read the newspapers and seen the suggestion which the minister has made, and I hope that he will then give the minister the authority, which, he has suggested, he is willing to act on. I do not think in that event that the committee will find any fault with our having a look at the documents, and in the meantime I will have a chance to look further into this matter.

Mr. FULTON: If you desire time in which to consider your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person to object to your taking what time you consider necessary. I would urge strongly however, that you should not delay it beyond the period between the present time and the next meeting of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I will make a ruling at the next meeting, and I hope that tomorrow when I am ready to make the ruling and proceed to do so I shall not be branded as a dictator. I see Mr. Thatcher here, and he wants the floor. He is the gentleman whom I asked to sit down on that occasion. I can see as I look back on it and consider the record that there may have been a misunderstanding over this, and I do not want to have any hard feelings over misunderstandings. I asked him to sit down because I wanted to make a

ruling which I had reserved from the previous meeting, but it may have appeared to some members of the committee that I was not prepared to hear argument on new points of order which had arisen. I want to make that clear now so that members will know that when tomorrow I indicate I wish to make a ruling I intend to make that ruling and I hope I shall not be branded as a dictator again, since I am a man who has always prided himself on being a supporter of democratic principles, and I do not like to be so branded.

Mr. THATCHER: I supported the original motion of Mr. Fulton, Mr. Chairman, thinking there may have been some advantage in having the witnesses he has mentioned appear before us, but this matter was being debated a week ago, and I am surprised that it is still coming up.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it Mr. Thatcher is going to speak to Mr. Fulton's motion, and I claim priority.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak to the motion, Mr. Michener? I would ask you to speak to it without taking up too much time, because I think many of our colleagues think we are spending a disproportionate amount of time on one point.

Mr. THATCHER: I think we should move down to the estimates now. I think Mr. Fulton has made his point. It is a good one, and I do not see the sense of rehashing it.

Mr. FULTON: Since we will be bound by a ruling given by the chairman as to the propriety of the motion, I should like to be permitted to speak briefly to the point of order so that you will have my views before you, Mr. Chairman, when you consider your ruling. You said you would still have to summon the witness, even though he was present to give evidence. I do not want you to be over-technical, for I do not think that this really represents an obstacle in our way, because, should the committee express the desire to hear evidence from these people, all that would be necessary would be a letter or a telephone call, and no formal summons need be issued.

The CHAIRMAN: The point I was making is that I have no power to send for witnesses, formally or informally. I have been given no power by the House to do it. There is no getting round the fact that in effect I, as your chairman, would have to summon him to give evidence. I still think you have not got round the point of order, but it is an ingenious attempt.

Mr. FULTON: May makes it quite clear that without any express authority for that purpose they may examine witnesses appearing before them. No one is going to be in the room unless an invitation is issued, but an invitation is very different from a summons.

The CHAIRMAN: I think not. It says: "To send for a witness".

Mr. FULTON: You are not sending for him.

The CHAIRMAN: If I say it is all right for him to come, am I not sending for him?

Mr. FULTON: If you are going to use that kind of technicality, which is far fetched—I was going to say "absurd"—it would make the sensible conclusions given here in May meaningless. I am suggesting that we avail ourselves of the opportunity given to us according to the rule cited in May, because I think, notwithstanding what you have said, that this committee does sit to investigate facts.

The CHAIRMAN: If you get round our absolute lack of power to send for witnesses by having a witness here and moving that he be heard, then of course you have certainly got round the matter in a very patent way, and if you can do it properly, I have no objection, but rather than have you openly get round the rule like that, I think I should look into it more closely.

Mr. FULTON: I am not "openly getting round" any rule—

The CHAIRMAN: That is the proper way to get round it—to do as openly—and if I think you have done so I will rule accordingly. But I would like to look into the matter further because obviously it is something which will come up in the future.

Mr. MICHENER: I was going to say something in relation to what the minister told us. I understand the minister's point is that the documents which he has in mind, and those which he is unable to produce should be looked at to see whether they would justify Mr. Taylor being called as a witness. This motion is a motion to hear Mr. Taylor if he is willing to give evidence. On that basis I suggest the position the minister takes is really not tenable. If Mr. Taylor can give evidence as the result of his experience with department officials throughout the country in the course of his practice, and since it is his own evidence, I assume the documents are some attempt of Mr. Taylor's to put down what he has found. They are really secondary evidence, whereas Mr. Taylor's own account is the primary evidence. It seems to me that the minister is saying first: "I cannot produce these documents" and second: "The committee should not hear Mr. Taylor until he has read those documents."

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Not until we have seen the documents.

The CHAIRMAN: I see your point Mr. Michener. Let us not waste any time on it. The minister has said he is not a lawyer and so was not being technical. He was talking on the question whether we should hear these gentlemen. We have not got that question yet because I am going to rule tomorrow whether it is proper to make a motion that we hear Mr. Taylor at all. If I rule the motion in order, then the minister's remarks would come into question. But we have not got to that point yet.

Mr. MCLEOD: I would just like to say a few words further on this point. I understand that if Mr. Taylor appears he will be introducing something which is not contained in the reports we have heard so much about.

The CHAIRMAN: If he appears here, Mr. McLeod, he would be subject to be examined, and any questions which are within the scope of our inquiry would be admissible whether they are in relation to the document or not. If we decide to hear him as a witness, and if I decide we have that right—

Mr. FULTON: May I point out that although I did not read out the other motion, I made another motion in the same form which I handed in. It is a motion that we invite Mr. McDonald to appear also.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, that is fine. If there is no one else who wishes to speak on that question of whether the motion is in order or not, we shall proceed with the consideration of the estimates.

Mr. FULTON: There is another matter which I wish to raise which arises out of a previous discussion. It is a matter which I do not think has been sufficiently studied by the committee, namely the rather delicate question of the position of the minister. It was referred to by Mr. Michener a moment ago when he speculated on whether or not the committee would be influenced by the minister's attitude to its suggestions. I would point out to the committee that on any occasion when we have been dealing with motions relating to the production of documents or the calling of witnesses, the minister has immediately indicated his objection to the acceptance of motions on those subjects. In these matters, of course, the minister is here only as a member of the committee with no greater rights than anyone else. But the fact is that he is at the same time the minister of the department whose estimates we are investigating; he is in charge of that department of government and of course if the minister indicates his disapproval of a certain suggestion or a certain course, this carries a great deal of weight with other members of the committee and

it has been obvious that it carries very great weight with those members of the committee who support the government. Therefore it appears that it is not conducive to the best and most impartial investigation and consideration of the work before the committee that a minister whose department is under investigation should be a member of the body which is making the investigation. I prefaced my remarks in part by referring to what the present minister has done or said, however they do not apply to him exclusively they would apply equally to the minister of any other department whose estimates may come up before the committee.

Incidentally, I may say I have made some investigations and I am informed that in the United Kingdom it would not be considered for a moment that the minister of a department whose estimates were before a committee should sit as a member of that committee.

Incidentally I find that the practice there is that the committee itself decides on the estimates which it will ask to have referred to it. That decision is not made by the government initially simply referring estimates to a committee. So I move, seconded by Mr. Monteith,

that in the opinion of this committee it is not desirable that ministers of departments whose estimates are before the committee should be members of the committee during the period of the study of the estimates of their own departments, and that the committee recommend to the House accordingly.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I suppose, to be logical we have to have the minister of each of the supply departments answer to his estimates because this committee is doing part of the work of the committee of supply. It seems ridiculous for a minister not to have equal standing among his colleagues in the House.

Mr. FULTON: As to that, I think it has been agreed as a matter of record that the United Kingdom committee on estimates functions well, serves a useful purpose, and contributes to the work of parliament, and I point out that it is unthinkable to their minds, and their practice confirms it, that the minister whose department is being considered in that committee on estimates should be a member of the committee.

An Hon. MEMBER: I should imagine that a greater proportion of their time is spent on studying the estimates than on points of order.

Mr. FULTON: I am not raising points of order.

Mr. HENRY: From my observation of the practice of the present government of the province of Ontario, the committees which that government sets up have the ministers on them.

An Hon. MEMBER: Question!

Mr. HELLYER: I agree with Mr. Benidickson that the minister should be a member of the committee and should have all the rights and privileges of other members of the committee. I think that that is on the record. What was the decision the last time it was raised?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It was never decided.

Mr. HELLYER: Mr. Fulton complains about the minister's suggestions to the committee. If Mr. Fulton made suggestions as sensible as those of the minister, we might give them more support from these benches.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the point is this, that this committee comes into existence only by virtue of a decision of the House, and we have only the rights that the House gives us. The people on this committee are here only because the House puts them here, and, having been appointed, they are under the obligation to attend here and do their duty on this committee. The minister now has been appointed to this committee by order of the House of Commons, and any reflection upon his acting as a member of this committee

is a reflection upon the decision of the House of Commons to appoint him. If we were to say that in our opinion it is not desirable that the minister should be here, we are passing a vote of censure on the House of Commons, since they have already appointed the minister to the committee. I am quite satisfied in my own mind that it would be regarded as simply outrageous that a select committee set up by the House of Commons should take upon itself a vote of censure to the House of Commons itself. I do not think that this committee really should be asked seriously to consider what in effect is a censure of the House of Commons. I think that we are getting to the point where the House of Commons might say that this committee is beginning to think that it is superior to the House instead of being the servant of the House. It is only in existence because of the action of the House. Now, this is so unusual, gentlemen, and so absolutely unheard of that I doubt if there is anything in the books on it. I am just going to say that I will leave it to the committee without having an argument as to wheher it is in order or not. I think it would be very hard to find any precedent on this. I shall leave it to the committee as to whether they want to adopt this motion or not. Is it the committee's wish to eccept this motion of Mr. Fulton's?

Mr. FULTON: Before you put the question, there might be a little more argument on the merits.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose that we are going to have to resign ourselves for the whole of this sitting to these points of order. So we may as well accept the situation. Is there something that you wanted to say, Mr. McLeod?

Mr. FULTON: If you are suggesing that a member cannot speak on the motion—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McLeod asked for the floor before you did.

Mr. FULTON: If you made less unnecessary comments we would get along faster.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members may say that your comments are more unnecessary than mine are. Mr. McLeod has been trying to get me to give him the floor, and when I try to give him the floor Mr. Fulton objects. I must tell you, Mr. Fulton, and I so rule, that Mr. McLeod has as many rights in this committee as you have.

Mr. FULTON: I support your ruling—

Mr. MCLEOD: I am not going to take too much of the time of the committee, but I should like to say a few words. I think that some of the things said in support of the motion are a reflection on the members of this committee. For instance, I believe the statement was made that we were being unduly influenced by the minister. Well, so far as I am concerned, I resent that. Whether the minister is a member of this committee or not, I pay attention to what he tells me, and I accept it for what it is worth. I may say that I have been greatly impressed by the evidence that has been given. I believe that it has been given straightforwardly and with sincerity. I resent any suggestion that we are being unduly influenced. That is the part that I do not like.

As far as his being a member of the committee is concerned, I was inclined to disagree with the minister's being made a member of the committee, not on the grounds that have been mentioned here but rather because I felt that it would weaken his position. However, that has been done; the House has made him a member of the committee. I am carrying on and trying to get a little cooperation in this committee. I am supposed to be in the group that is called the opposition. Still, being in that group, I maintain that it is my duty to weigh the evidence as it is given, and if there is anything that comes up

that in my estimation needs to be opposed, or if anything comes up that I feel is worthy of commendation, I want to be free to adopt whatever course seems necessary. We have had representatives of the legal department telling us of the actions that they have seen fit to take in various cases that have come before them for attention. We have had the matter of improper care of immigrants in transit on ships, and everything has been clearly and directly discussed. We have had the question of the care of immigrants after arrival, and they did the same with that. As one of the opposition groups, I must state now clearly and frankly that I have been greatly impressed by the evidence that has been given. Now, a further suggestion I would make is that we get on with the business of estimates.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I speak, does that rule out the possibility of my speaking later?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I just wanted to make one personal observation on the subject of my being made a member of the committee. I asked the government whip to have me made a member of the committee for one reason only. Certain allegations were made about me personally. I attempted to reply at once to those allegations, and it was said that I was not a member of the committee and did not have the right to speak. I felt that, as a member of parliament who was elected in exactly the same way as any other member of parliament, I should not be put in that rather undignified position before my fellows. If that situation had not arisen, I would never have made the request, but it did arise and in the circumstances I felt I had to be given a reasonable right to reply at the time the allegations were made and not some days later. Even if I am a minister, I do not think that is an unreasonable attitude to take. Since I have been a member of the committee, I know I have been rather loquacious, and perhaps I have sometimes spoken oftener and longer than I should have, but I will try to do better in the future.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, there are two things that should be dealt with in considering the merits of this motion. One arises from the suggestion that it would amount to a censure of the House of Commons, and the other from the remarks just made by the minister. I submit that it is perfectly obvious that in a motion of this kind there is no censure of the House either implied or expressed. It is so well known that it really should not need restating, that the committee has power to make recommendations. That is one of the features of the committee. What the committee is being asked to do in this motion is simply to make a recommendation to the House. If the committee had not the power or the right to make a recommendation to the House of Commons, then the committee would have no purpose. It would be pointless to set it up and it would be pointless to continue its proceedings. To suggest that a recommendation from this committee to the House is a censure of an action of the House is not in the least well-founded. As a matter of fact, committees in the past have gone much further than we have suggested in this motion in making recommendations to the House. On the question of whether committees may make recommendations to the House, I refer to a committee of 1873, which said to the House of Commons: "You have to pass a special Act to give us the power to administer oaths to witnesses." They recommended to the House accordingly. That was a far-reaching recommendation. At that time the House did not get insulted or say that this was a censure; it went ahead and passed an Act of Parliament to enable the committee to do the job that the committee thought it should do. That is all that is being asked in this motion. I take the view that the committee's proceedings in investigating

the affairs of a department would be better conducted, and with more advantage to the results of that investigation, if the minister whose department is under investigation did not become a member of the investigating body. After all, while I am not saying that this is exactly the same as a trial in court, you do not have the accused as a member of the jury.

An Hon. MEMBER: Who is accused?

Mr. FULTON: I was careful to say that it is not exactly the same case, but I am suggesting that there is a certain parallel, if you like. It is most unreasonable that the minister whose department is under investigation should be a member of the investigating body, doing, as he would be bound to do, what he can to influence the course of the inquiry along the lines that he thinks it should take.

With regard to the point raised by the minister himself that the reason why he did this was that he would have the right to speak, I regret that I do not agree with the interpretation of the facts which the minister gave. My recollection is that we were discussing whether we should get a certain witness to give evidence before the committee. The minister wanted to make a statement about that, which he said he would make in the nature of a question of privilege. I think it was Mr. Cameron who raised the point that the minister was not actually a member. What I pointed out was that under those circumstances, if the minister were to make a statement he could only make it in the position of a witness, because, you will remember, the argument then before us was whether we would call witnesses. I pointed out that if the minister was to be given that right, which I said at the time I felt he should have—the right to make a statement—then the acceptance of that position implied the right of the committee to hear witnesses, and that if the minister was to make a statement, it automatically followed that we would hear other witnesses on the same points involved. As a matter of fact, the minister will recall that he was given the right to make the statement, and I think that any minister here as a witness before the committee, if the committee should send for him and if he wishes to make a statement, whether on a personal matter or with reference to the suggestions of the committee, would always have the right to make that statement. He would make the statement, however, not as a member of the committee. Confirmation of that suggestion is found in the fact that the minister was given the right to make that statement on that occasion.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Why did you not object in the House when the motion was put for the nomination of the minister to the committee?

Mr. MICHENER: There was no debate on the motion.

Mr. FULTON: There were two reasons. The first is that it is an accepted practice in the House of Commons—and one which I think should be accepted because the opposite would give rise to all sorts of unfortunate implications—that decisions as to which of its members a party wishes to have appointed and a committee are made within that party, the decision being communicated to the government whip, who rules accordingly in the House. It is the practice and custom—and, I think, a proper custom—that motions for changes in the personnel of the committees of the House are not debated by members in the House. Of course any member of the House has the theoretical right to oppose it, but I think that it would give rise to all sorts of unfortunate precedents if, let us say—and this might well happen with any other committee of this sort—my party felt that I should be on the committee and it was by practice open to the hon. gentlemen on the government side to debate it. In the light of what has been happening here, I am afraid they might oppose the motion! They have the majority in the House, of course, and it would not carry. For that reason it is regarded as a matter of domestic arrangement which the parties

have a right to make, as to which of their personnel will appear on these committees, without debate in the House.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Why did you not oppose the motion?

Mr. FULTON: Another reason is that it was put very quickly, and I doubt if there was an opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a reflection on the House of Commons. You have no right to comment on the way in which the Speaker does his work in the House of Commons.

Mr. FULTON: Very well, I accept your remarks there. The other reason why it was not debated in the House was this. I do not want to revive a discussion which has already taken place, but I have been asked a question. It was understood that the propriety of the minister's being on the committee would be discussed in this committee, and I understood that we would arrive at a decision on that motion here and that it would not be until that had been done that any action would be taken in the House. I don't mind admitting that I was taken by surprise by what happened in the House and, on giving it such immediate reflection as I could, I felt that the best thing to do was not to take action in the House but to raise it for careful consideration in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, that motion is debatable. This very question was dealt with in the House. Had that particular question been raised the motion would probably have been permitted to stand or at any rate it would have been discussed. However, when it was agreed to unanimously, there was no reason to think that anybody objected to it. To try to raise it afterwards in this committee, after it had been agreed to unanimously in the House and when this very point you mention could have been raised in the House and was not—that was the place to raise it—then, of course, it was quite out of order to raise it in this committee. There is no doubt that it could have been debated and it was not. As to everything else, I think you can understand what amount of restraint I am putting on myself by not answering the various points raised by Mr. Fulton. I am tempted to do so but I am not going to. If anybody else wants to do so of course they may.

Mr. THATCHER: I should like to say this, Mr. Chairman. I do not want Mr. Fulton to become impatient with me, but I am becoming a little impatient with him. It seems to me that this committee was set up as an experiment to see if we could not save the taxpayer some money. It seems to me that we are wasting half the time of this committee on technicalities. I am no lawyer, but I should like to get down to that job. If we do not, the committee probably will not be set up next year. I think that Mr. Fulton is doing a disservice to himself and to his party by bringing these technical issues up time and again and preventing us from getting to the main work which we should be doing. Perhaps you will not object when I say that I hope that this is the last motion of this nature that he will move for a long time.

Mr. HENRY: Mr. Fulton is talking about a matter that was debatable as a right in the House of Commons but is not debatable by custom.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion by Mr. Fulton that in the opinion of this committee it is not desirable that ministers of departments whose estimates are before the committee for investigation and study should be members of the committee during the period of such study of their own department, and that the committee recommend to the House accordingly. Those in favour of that motion will please—

Mr. FULTON: I should like to have a poll taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you answer your names as called by the clerk. Those in favour of the motion say "Yes", to the contrary, "No".

(A polled vote was taken).

The CLERK: Yeas 8, Nays 13.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. Now, Mr. Thatcher brought up a question which was deferred until today. I am told that the minister is ready to deal with it. That is the question of personnel. That comes under item 66.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. Thatcher has not met Mr. Abbott, the chief of personnel, who is here. I do not know whether Mr. Thatcher wants to question him or whether he would like him to make a statement first.

Mr. THATCHER: Would he make a statement?

Mr. J. K. ABBOTT (Chief of Personnel, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chairman, The personnel division of the administrative branch serves all branches of the department. It is a staff side division which acts in an advisory capacity to management, and it is directly responsible to the deputy minister.

To describe the duties of the division, the functions have been grouped under three separate headings: Organization and Personnel, Accounts and Attendance, and Records.

The highlights of the work performed under this functional break down are as follows:

Under Organization and Personnel: screening requests for new positions and changes in classification received from the branches; the review and preparation of establishments; the analysis and implementation of the Civil Service Commission's reports on "Organization and Classification" and "Organization and Methods", and, determining methods of selection.

I should explain that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for the selection of persons from outside of the service but we have a responsibility, for when a vacancy occurs, it must be determined whether it should be filled by transfer from within the department, departmental promotion, promotion open to the government service, or a competition open to the general public.

Under this heading we also review employees' performance during probationary periods, prepare and conduct promotion competitions restricted to employees of the department; conduct appeal boards held for the denial of statutory increases and represent the department on appeal boards for promotion competitions. Interview and counsel employees, arrange for annual efficiency ratings, analyze turnover, absenteeism and manpower requirements; and work with staff associations.

Under Accounts and Attendance are listed the preparation of staff pay certificates (this involves all calculations for salary payments, including deductions for such items as income tax, civil service medical, civil service insurance, Blue Cross, etc.); the preparation of overtime staff pay certificates; matters involving superannuation, the preparation of salary estimates, the maintenance of leave and attendance registers, which includes the review of requests for leave.

Lastly, under Records, we have the maintenance of personnel division files, the sorting, indexing and distribution of mail, and the maintenance of the Kardex records system.

With reference to the item shown in the estimates for eleven personnel officer positions, I should explain that seven of these positions are not new but result from a new class for persons engaged in personnel duties which was introduced by the Civil Service Commission during 1954. Previously the positions had been classified under the administrative officer or clerical series.

To be more specific, the positions listed in our estimates this year are for the following employees:

A personnel officer, grade 4, for the assistant chief of the division, two personnel officers, grade 2, in the organization and personnel section; one for the employee who supervises the Indian Affairs work, the other for the person who supervises the work for the remainder of the department. One personnel officer, grade 1, position is for an employee engaged or organizational work. Seven personnel officers, grade 1, positions are for personnel officers in training. The new positions are in this group.

To ensure that the Division works with maximum efficiency, we have requested three surveys in the past two years by the Organization and Methods Division and the Organization and Classification Division of the Civil Service Commission. These surveys have not resulted in major changes in our methods of operation, and they support the number of positions which have been submitted in the Estimates for 1955-56.

Mr. THATCHER: Can you tell us how many new employees your department had last year, for instance. What was your staff turnover?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Do you want the additions or just the turnover, or the total number of new employees?

Mr. THATCHER: The total number of new employees of the department.

Mr. ABBOTT: Our staff turnover last year amounted to 18 per cent. On the basis of the estimates for the fiscal year 1955-56, we expect to have a turnover in excess 700 next year.

Mr. THATCHER: That is about double the figure which the deputy minister mentioned some short time ago?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes, I said 400 at that time.

Mr. THATCHER: Is not some of that work which you have mentioned duplicated by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ABBOTT: There is no duplication. For example, in the preparation of estimates the branches indicate to us the positions they feel they need to carry out their functions. We review them very carefully before they go to the establishment review committee, and last year the majority of the changes or reductions in establishment were made by the Personnel Division before our requirements were presented to the establishment control committee.

Mr. THATCHER: You mentioned you gave counsel to employees. Along what line would you have to counsel them?

Mr. ABBOTT: They may ask us for advice. For example, they may require information about superannuation, to determine whether they should go ahead and pay for past military service. We can give some advice on matters of this type.

Mr. THATCHER: And seven of the eleven employees shown on page 142, you say were just transferred?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, seven of them are for employees who have been with us for some time. A new class has been established for personnel officers by the Civil Service Commission. I cannot state the exact reason for establishing this class as this is a matter under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service, but seven of our positions occupied by old employees are now classified under this heading.

Mr. THATCHER: And do you feel that these eleven are absolutely needed and that your department can keep them busy?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, I think I can honestly say that our people in the personnel division are all quite busy.

Mr. THATCHER: Thank you for your explanation. I had based my comments on a lower figure for the staff turnover than the one you have given. In view of the fact that the turnover is between 700 and 800 it does not seem so extreme; it is not so bad as it looked, so I am not going to move.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the Indian Affairs staff come under the same personnel officers as we have been discussing?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, they are under the same division. We are responsible for personnel administration in all branches of the department.

Mr. MICHENER: So the separation of the administrative branch is not complete?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Its relation to the Indian Affairs branch is exactly the same as it is to that of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. MICHENER: Can you tell us about the work of the purchasing officers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Abbott can perhaps tell you whether he thinks we need the number of purchasing officers we have. But I think the deputy minister should tell us about their work.

Mr. MICHENER: Perhaps we can get it by asking what is the total value of the purchases made in the course of a year.

Mr. W. J. BRENNAN (Departmental Administrative Officer, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): There is a small purchasing division in the department which serves all the branches, procuring materials not normally procured from the Department of Public Works, such as furniture, office furnishings, or the Queen's printer, stationery items, typewriters and so on. The purchasing division consists of a staff of seven. The purchasing agent and two purchasing officers are responsible for the procurement of all materials and supplies required by the Indian Affairs branch or the Immigration branch. Around the end of November of last year it was estimated that the Purchasing Division would purchase between $6 million and $7 million worth of materials a year, mainly construction items, materials and supplies or anything else used in construction in connection with Indian Affairs.

Mr. MICHENER: That would be mainly Indian Affairs, which has not a separate purchasing division?

Mr. BRENNAN: Indian Affairs is the main branch requiring the service. The Immigration branch needs materials for its detention buildings or its kitchens across Canada, but it amounts to a very small percentage of what Indian Affairs would purchase.

Mr. THATCHER: Is that operated separately from the purchasing departments of other departments?

Mr. FORTIER: It serves our department.

Mr. THATCHER: I imagine there would be duplication there, if we have a separate purchasing department for every one of our separate departments of government.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Maybe you might ask that question of the Minister of Finance during the budget debate.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you any liaison with the Minister of Public Works when you purchase this construction material. Do you go to Public Works?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course we apply to Public Works for all the services which the Department of Public Works provides. If we want offices for the Immigration branch or the Citizenship branch, or any other branch of the department in Canada, we go to the Department of Public Works. With one exception. As I am sure you know very well, Mr. Thatcher, we do our own construction in the Indian Affairs department. In that connection Mr. Winters and I have initiated discussions to see whether some economies could not be

effected if some part of that work could be done by the Department of Public Works instead of by my department.

Mr. THATCHER: You said that the main part of the materials bought were construction materials.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think perhaps I could make that clear. When there is a building to be built, it is done by the construction division of the Indian Affairs branch; but when, as is often the case, it is merely a question of purchasing some lumber or builders supplies so that the Indian agent on a reserve can get some Indian labour to repair a building or something of that sort we do not waste the time of construction division; the purchase is made by the purchasing agent.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you call for tenders?

Mr. BRENNAN: Yes, the purchasing agent will call for tenders in all cases except where small purchases are made and even then he may get two or three tenders with a view to saving a few dollars for the department. He has an established procedure of calling for tenders. The tenders are, of course, received and examined and orders are placed usually on the basis of the lowest tender.

Mr. THATCHER: I think there is a situation where there might be some savings made if the purchasing departments were amalgamated. In that way we would be able to take advantage of bulk buying.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a very big question, and it has been debated ever since I came to Ottawa. It has enthusiastic protagonists inside the public service, and one or two who are in the government. There are also a lot of sceptics and I am afraid that I am among the latter group. I find that if you have a small unit doing its own job you do not require so many stenographers and telephones. Once you get a big department to do the job there does seem to be a lot of proliferation and I would not be a bit surprised if the overhead from having a central purchasing department for these relatively small purchases would not outweigh the economy in the end.

Mr. THATCHER: But if you have one department you are bound to have much less duplication and unnecessary work than if you have 20 departments doing the same job.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You and I have our opinions, Mr. Thatcher, and this might be a good subject for a royal commission one day.

Mr. THATCHER: There is one other question. I have noticed in Public Accounts and elsewhere that sometimes a government department has missed getting cash discounts because they have been slow in paying their bills. What provision has your department for avoiding this?

Mr. BRENNAN: I am quite certain that this is a matter which our treasury officers would be very careful about and I think they would try to get all the discounts they possibly could.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Just for the sake of making a debating point out of it, I would say this: in the old days, before we had the centralization in the treasury, all bills were paid by the departments. That was long before my time. Each department paid its own bills. Nowadays the bills go to the comptroller of the treasury, and he pays them. Whether that has been an economy or not, I do not know.

Mr. THATCHER: Sometimes they are a bit tardy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think for the big things it is probably a good idea, but for some of these little things it may slow up the procedure.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if the overseas officers are in somewhat the same position as the personnel officers, particularly as to recruitment. How do you recruit officers for overseas when you want a man to fill an overseas post?

Mr. SMITH: They are selected from among the existing trained staff in Canada. They go before a selection board.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that your board?

Mr. SMITH: Yes and cosists of an official representing the personnel, the administrative and the operation or management units of the branch.

Mr. MICHENER: How is an applicant put in touch with a vacancy?

Mr. SMITH: He makes application through his district superintendent. The notice comes from headquarters that we shall require a certain number of officers for overseas duties. We work on a 3½ year rotation period. A man comes home from service abroad after 3½ years. He may be sent back for a second tour of duty, or he may be retained in Canada, because his services were not entirely satisfactory, or because he may not wish to go back for a further tour of duty. In addition he may remain here to apply for promotion to a post advertised through the Civil Service.

Mr. MICHENER: When you get a new man in the department how is the post advertised?

Mr. SMITH: Through the advertisements of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MICHENER: So that all the initial appointments to the department are made through the Civil Service Commission, but changes within the department are made by the department itself.

Mr. SMITH: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: What percentage, if any, of your employees in foreign countries are non-Canadian?

Mr. ABBOTT: The largest group are non-Canadian or what we call locally engaged. I cannot be exact, but I would say that the locally engaged represent between 60 and 68 per cent of our overseas employees. They are mainly employed in junior clerical and stenographic positions.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And as messengers?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are automobiles purchased for the commission by these purchasing agents?

Mr. BRENNAN: Yes.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does each government department look after its own needs with regard to automobiles?

Mr. FORTIER: They do. We are looking after our own needs all right.

Mr. DINSDALE: How are they purchased, by tender?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes, by tender.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is a directive of the Treasury Board on that subject, if Mr. Brennan would read it to the committee.

Mr. BRENNAN: I might read this. There are several sections. The regulations governing the purchase of motor vehicles are contained in a minute of Treasury Board issued on January 14, 1955 which reads in part as follows:

Consolidation of Motor Vehicle Regulations

1. At least three competitive bids shall be obtained where possible and shall include one tender on at least one of the two makes with the lowest retail price at factory.

2. The makes of vehicles that may be purchased shall be restricted to those of the same percentage of British Empire content as is required for Customs Drawback purposes.

3. Purchase or replacement of passenger cars shall be restricted to the standard coupe or coach type.

4. Purchase or replacement of passenger cars shall be restricted to instances where the prospective mileage will be at least 6,000 per annum for at least three years.

5. Replacement of a passenger car shall not be made until the vehicle has been driven at least 60,000 miles.

6. Procedure in respect of applications for the purchase of motor vehicles additional to current establishments or required to replace used units shall be as follows:

(*a*) All applications for the procurement of motor vehicles will be submitted to the committee in triplicate; in cases of vehicles additional to current establishments, departmens will use form M.V. 4, and in cases of replacement of motor vehicles, departments will use form M.V. 5.

(*b*) Return to the department of the original and the duplicate copy with the committee's authorization noted on both, if the committee have concurred in the recommendation.

(*c*) if purchase has been authorized by the committee, the department shall forward the original application form to the Chief Treasury Officer concerned.

(*d*) If the purchase recommended by the department is not authorized by the committee, the department may, if it wishes, submit the matter to the Board for a decision.

7. Motor vehicles which become surplus to requirements shall be reported to the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation.

8. Every Government-owned motor vehicle, except those specifically exempted by the Board, shall be plainly marked in conspicuous letters, not less than one and one-half inches in height, in the centre of both front door panels as follows: Canada—Department of ..... (or Board, Commission, etc., whichever is appropriate) with such other identification as may be desired.

The remainder deals with the cost records that will be maintained by the department and submitted to the Treasury Board at regular intervals for scrutiny.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one aspect that stretches my opinion of cabinet solidarity to the limit. I simply hate these motorcars with only two doors. I do not think that they are really economical, but the Treasury Board has not been convinced of that.

Mr. THATCHER: May I ask the minister a question on the subject of motorcars? As I recall, two years ago in front of the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Sellar—I believe it was—pointed out that the Department of National Defence buys its cars direct from the factory but other departments buy them from the retail dealer. I just cannot get through my head the reason for that. I suppose there is an obvious one, but it would seem to me that if the Department of National Defence can buy directly, the other departments would save money by doing the same.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suppose that the reason is that the factories are in Windsor and Oshawa and the cars are wanted in Moose Jaw and Brandon.

Mr. THATCHER: That is no answer, of course, Mr. Minister. If the factory is willing to sell them to the government directly, certainly the volume of purchase that the government has in a year would justify it. If the government policy in one department is to buy them directly and save money, why should it not be done here? I do not know how many cars your department buys. Perhaps it is only two or three in a year, which is not very much, but if

you take all the 19-odd departments of government there might be a substantial saving if they bought them direct. As far as the trade-ins are concerned, you could turn them over to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation and sell them perhaps as efficiently as the trade.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That might be the nigger in the woodpile. Quite frankly, I do not know. This is the policy of the government. It is not departmental business, but in so far as it is the concern of one minister it would be that of the Minister of Finance. It is a matter which I could not change. I might advocate a change.

Mr. THATCHER: If you thought it was inefficient I suppose that you could recommend that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, to be quite honest, I have never given the matter two minutes' consideration in my life.

Mr. HELLYER: I think that there was a time when this question might have been one of real consequence, but at the present time the discount rates are so high in most cases that there would be practically no significant difference between the kind of price you could obtain, say, in Toronto and prices you would get direct from the factory.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Two things occur to me. One is that they buy in great quantities when they buy a brand model, whereas the needs of the department are for a variety of types of vehicles. In addition to that, the defence people do their own servicing of their vehicles for the most part.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that that has a lot to do with it.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: If we buy for an Indian agent in my community, that is many miles from the factories and the big distributing centres. The Indian agent would require a local guarantee such as you and I would expect to get on the vehicle.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that Mr. Benidickson has probably put his finger on one very important factor. I do not think there is any doubt that some other factor enters into it. We hear complaints from certain parts of the country, notably from parts of Saskatchewan, and even sometimes from the government of Saskatchewan, that purchasing is all concentrated in the province of Ontario and the district of Montrael. This is one way in which it can be spread out a little.

Mr. THATCHER: I think that it should be spread out, if the price is equal. However, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have definite information from some minister—perhaps when we have the Minister of Finance would be the appropriate time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suggest that this would be a very proper point to raise in the budget debate. Surely that is what the budget debate is for.

Mr. THATCHER: No, I think that this committee should get it. Is the Department of Finance coming before this committee?

An Hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Then I shall leave it until then.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am powerless to do anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I should point out to Mr. Thatcher, who, it seems to me, wavers between free enterprise and socialism, that there is this feature about what you suggest. If you go to a local dealer, you know he is going to make sure he sells the trade-in at the highest possible sale price. When he finds out that he can probably dispose of that car by virtue of hard work at a good price, he probably will be able to give a much better allowance to the government on the trade-in on the car being purchased than you would get for the trade-in through any central government surplus sales agency.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you mean that the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is not operating—

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the individual dealer is likely to get more for the government for the car that is being traded in than it would get by turning all the cars over to the surplus war assets corporation and leaving such cars with them to sell.

Mr. FULTON: I understand that they do—

The CHAIRMAN: Under the present system the department gets some very good deals, and in the cases I know of they get far more from trade-ins than the surplus war assets corporation would get.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do not call it "war". The war is over.

Mr. THATCHER: That is your opinion, but I think that the government may be losing money.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is possible. It is the old argument between little business and big business. Mr. Tucker and I have an inclination toward little business.

Mr. STARR: I have another question. Can the government buy cars directly from the factory at factory prices?

Mr. THATCHER: They are doing it in the Department of National Defence.

The CHAIRMAN: You can just imagine what would happen if you were running a garage, say, in Moose Jaw and the federal government bought cars in Oshawa. After a certain time, they would say, "Will you please service this car?" The dealer would probably say, "Take your car where you bought it."

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not want to raise a point of order against the chairman, but I am apparently going to be before this committee for quite a long time. I have indicated quite clearly that a change in this policy is completely beyond my scope. Could we not go on to something which I could do something about?

Mr. FULTON: May I ask this? Perhaps Mr. Brennan could give me this information. Do you maintain an approved list of firms who will be asked to tender for the supply of automobiles to this department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall answer any questions of that kind myself, and I think I have something on the subject which Mr. Harris said some years ago. I have not changed it. I think that this was a question that was passed as an order of the House by Mr. E. D. Fulton, M.P., on February 11, 1953. The answer given at that time is precisely the answer now.

Mr. FULTON: I do not remember precisely what the answer was. I asked before in this committee whether your department maintained approved lists of firms and my recollection is that you said, "No". My recollection of the previous answer was, however, to the effect that it did do so, and that is the reason why I raised the matter again.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought I said, "No, not to my knowledge", and then I said, "I do not know", or something to that effect. It must have been quite evident that this was in the area of ignorance in my mind, which is quite considerable. But I took it upon myself to find out about it. This is the answer that was given in this return. I will read it:

> The Department of Citizenship and Immigration maintains a list that has been built up over a period of many years—

I presume that this list must have been made up from some of the branches out of which the department was constructed—

> —of persons and firms from which materials and supplies may be purchased. The names were obtained from many sources, including field

officers familiar with local sources of supply and service. In addition, the Canadian Trades Index and Canadian Trade Directory are used. The lists are maintained for the convenience of persons required to purchase commodities for the department.

Mr. DINSDALE: On this particular point, are purchases restricted to the lower-priced cars of the big three manufacturers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: In each case, do you go to each of them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the regulations say that you have to ask for two, not just one.

Mr. DINSDALE: I believe he said that tenders were called.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It stipulates two makes of car, if I remember correctly.

Mr. THATCHER: Now that Hamilton has a car factory, why not include it? Then it would include the four Canadian cars.

Mr. HELLYER: Does it not say, "those cars with the lowest retail cost", or something to that effect?

Mr. BRENNAN: Part 1 of the regulations reads:

> At least three competitive bids shall be obtained where possible and shall include one tender on at least one of the two makes with the lowest retail price at factory.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: One of the two makes.

Mr. MICHENER: How many cars are operating in the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I could not have answered that question until this minute, but I have a piece of paper here which says that the number of departmental vehicles is as follows:

Trucks	96
Passenger cars	70
Jeeps	9
Snowmobiles	7
School buses	4
Total	181

That includes five passenger cars in Germany.

Mr. MICHENER: Could we have a breakdown of those, as between Immigration and Indian Affairs?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are five in the Immigration branch. It appears that the rest are in the Indian Affairs branch. The one for departmental administration has not been bought yet.

The CHAIRMAN: May we adjourn now?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn, I could file the answers now to the questions asked about the National Gallery. We could have them put on the record, if that would be satisfactory to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: They can appear as an appendix to our proceedings of today. Is that agreed?

Agreed. (See Appendix "C".)

We shall meet in this room at 10:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What shall we take up tomorrow morning?

The CHAIRMAN: We will go right on with this item.

APPENDIX "C"

THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF CANADA
OTTAWA

MARCH 9, 1955.

Memorandum for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

In connection with some remarks passed at the meeting of the Estimates Committee yesterday, the following figures have been compiled to show the relative numbers of Canadian paintings and drawings in the National Gallery collection as compared with those from European sources:

Old Master and Modern European Paintings	412
Old Master and Modern European Drawings	451
Total	863
Canadian Paintings and Drawings	1,324
War Collections:	
World War I—partly Canadian	
World War II—entirely Canadian	
	4,900

The above figures, which have been compiled with care to the end of the fiscal year 1952-53, but are unrevised, show that the Canadian collections greatly predominate in the National Gallery.

McC: 1am

H. O. McCURRY,
Director.

PAYMENTS MADE TO PRINCE OF LEICHENSTEIN AND PAINTINGS ACQUIRED

Payments made in 1953-54

April 18, 1953—$275,400 (authority T.B. 449074 Apr. 17, 1953)

Paintings

"Bathsheba at her Toilet"—by Rembrandt

Two panels from the series "The Life of Esther"— by Filippino Lippi.

December 14, 1953-54—$275,000 (authority T.B. 463318 Dec. 15/53)

Paintings

"Madonna and Child with Donor"—by Hans Memling

"Christ on the Cross"—by Quentin Massep

"Portrait of a Lady"—by Bartel Beham

Total amount paid in 1953-54—$550,400 of which $25,000 came from the Special Operating Account.

1954-55

April 7, 1954—$85,000 (authorities T.B. 463318 Dec. 15/53 and T.B. 468115 March 26/54)

Paintings

"The Lace Maker"—by Nicholas Maes

"The Church of Maria della Saluto, Venice"—by Francesco Guardi.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 10

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer, and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55107—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, March 11, 1955.
(11)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, Michener, Pickersgill, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

The Chairman ruled out of order two motions moved by Mr. Fulton on March 10 relating to the hearing of Mr. J. R. Taylor, Barrister of Vancouver, and Mr. John H. McDonald, Barrister of Ottawa.

The ruling of the Chairman having been appealed, it was sustained on the following recorded division:

Yeas: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Dupuis, Garland, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, Pickersgill, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Yuill—13.

Nays: Messrs. Dinsdale, Fulton, Michener—3.

Mr. Fulton gave notice of his intention to move the following motions:

(1) That the resolution of the Committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955, that the Committee not seek power to send for persons, papers and records, be read.

(2) That the resolution of the Committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955, that the Committee not seek power to send for persons, papers and records, be rescinded.

(3) That the Committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records.

The Committee resumed its consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Immigration Branch, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Item number 69 was adopted.

At 12.35 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. Monday, March 14.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

55107—1½

EVIDENCE

MARCH 11, 1955.
10:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, there is a quorum. If you will come to order, we will proceed. I have a motion before me on which I said I would make a ruling. In fact, there were two motions, moved by Mr. Fulton and seconded by Mr. Monteith. One is that the committee hear Mr. John R. Taylor, barrister, of Vancouver, on the subject of his study of the administration of the Immigration Act. The other is that the committee hear Mr. John H. McDonald, barrister, of Ottawa, on the subject of his study of the Immigration Act.

Mr. Fulton moved a motion on the 1st of March that Mr. John H. McDonald, barrister, of Ottawa, and Mr. John R. Taylor, barrister, of Vancouver, and Mr. John H. Dickey, M.P., of Halifax, be called to give evidence before the committee as the result of their investigation into the administration of the Immigration Act and as to any other matters arising therefrom on which the committee may deem it proper to question them; and that the appropriate recommendation be made to the House forthwith for the granting of any powers necessary in that regard.

On the 2nd March I ruled that motion out of order. I should say that it was understood that that motion was subject to our obtaining the power from the House to summon those witnesses.

The motions before us are that we hear two of these gentlemen. I understood from Mr. Fulton that he differentiates between these motions. There is no saving clause in these motions at all; they are not subject to obtaining power from the House. He differentiates between them because, he maintains, in one case he moved that these gentlemen be called and in the other case he is moving that we hear them. He cites May's 15th edition, page 599, which mentions a select committee on fisheries in regard to Ireland in 1849 and select committees on the civil list in Great Britain in 1910 and 1936, which were set up to look into certain facts in a certain situation and which decided to hear without any express authority for that purpose any witnesses who voluntarily appeared before them. It is to be noted there was apparently contrary rulings in Great Britain. May says that, based upon those rulings, other committees have regarded their powers of inquiry as restricted to the powers specifically given by the House on their appointment.

Apparently there is a difference of opinion as to our powers to hear witnesses who are here in front of us. I am very reluctant to make a ruling that might prevent us from hearing a witness whom the committee wanted to hear and who was present and ready to give evidence. He may be an expert on something on which the committee wanted to obtain information. I would not want to close the door on the committee's hearing such a person if it wished. My difficulty is this, that this matter has already been ruled upon that we have no power to send for anybody. To find this motion in order, I would have to know these people are present here so that if it passed they could be heard. Otherwise it is simply in effect a motion that we call these people, the same as the other motion. If we pass a motion to hear certain people and they are not here, then of course the only way it could be rendered effective would be for me to send for them; but I have no right to send for them unless I am authorized by the committee. The committee has no power to authorize me to send for

anybody. So, before I rule on this, I would have to know whether the foundation is there to differentiate between this and your previous motion, Mr. Fulton. Are these witnesses present and ready to be called?

Mr. FULTON: Are you asking me to answer that question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: I do not have any information as to whether they are in town at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN: I meant, in the room.

Mr. FULTON: Of course, they are not here in the room, because nobody has asked them yet to come, but Mr. Taylor has indicated that he would be glad to come at any time when the committee so indicates, which of course is quite different from summoning a witness.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite clear in my opinion that you are making a motion which in effect is exactly the same as the previous motion, since if it passed I would have to call them before the committee. I have to rule it out of order.

Mr. FULTON: Then I have to appeal your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton has appealed my ruling in this matter. Will those in favour of upholding my ruling vote yea and those against, nay. The clerk of the committee will call the roll of the members.

Mr. CAMERON (Nanaimo): Is this to sustain your ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

(A polled vote was taken).

The CLERK: Yeas 13, Nays 3.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the chairman's ruling sustained.

Mr. FULTON: Under the circumstances I wish to give notice—and I am not going to argue it here at length—of a motion which I propose to move at a subsequent meeting. You have in effect based your ruling upon the fact that the committee has no power to send for papers, persons and records, in the same way as you ruled the motion made on March 1 out of order and on the same grounds.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. FULTON: It appears, therefore, that in your view the committee is prevented by the fact that on an earlier occasion, on February 17, we decided not at that time to ask the House for that power?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: I have looked into this question of whether the committee would have any right or opportunity or method by which it could change its decision on that occasion. I find that in May, 15th edition, page 596, there is a statement which, I think, establishes that the committee can. I shall read the citation, and then go on to my motion:

> Rescission of resolutions of select committees.—It is a rule of the House of Commons that "every question by voice in committee bindeth, and cannot be altered by themselves.

That is based on precedents of 1547 and 1607, so that it is quite ancient. May continues:

> In practice, this rule is sometimes disregarded, and resolutions or other decisions of committees are rescinded.

He gives as authority precedents in 1873, 1881 and 1904.
He then continues:

> Previous notice must, however, be given to all the members of any motion for rescinding a resolution.

I find that there are precedents in Canada in which decisions of committees were rescinded. I have the Journals here where those decisions were taken and from the bare result in the Journals it does not appear that notice was regarded as being necessary. However, because of what is stated in May and because I think it is only fair to the committee that it should have notice of a motion to change a previous decision, I am giving notice now of my intention to move, firstly: that the resolution of the committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955, that the committee not seek power to send for persons, papers and records, be read; and then immediately the subsequent motion:

(1) that the resolution of the committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955, that the committee not seek power to send for persons, papers and records, be rescinded;

(2) that the committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records.

If you wish me to argue as to the propriety of that motion I would be glad to do so, but if you would prefer me to wait until I move the motion that will be agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be better. I could look at the question in the meantime, though it is a question which seems to have a lot of doubt surrounding it. Would you like to put the Canadian citations on the record?

Mr. FULTON: Yes. Journals of 1873, volume 6 and volume 7. Volume 6 at page 294—this I may point out Mr. Chairman was a committee which was investigating the Pacific scandal. It was a committee on whose findings the fate of the government depended. That government was defeated as a result of that matter, so it will be appreciated that it was a very vital and important committee.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the other citation?

Mr. FULTON: The government had a majority on the committee. The committee came to the conclusion that it should hold its proceedings in camera or in secret, yet on May 7, 1873 as recorded at page 294 of volume 6 of the Journals you will find the following:

moved by Mr. Blake—

and he was a member of the opposition party—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: A very distinguished one.

Mr. FULTON:

—Resolved, that the resolution of the committee come to on the 5th of May instant touching the secrecy of its proceedings be read.

Second: Resolved that the said resolution be rescinded; and

Third: Resolved that the public be admitted during the taking of the evidence before the committee.

That was also carried.

So the committee first of all rescinded the previous resolution, and then resolved in exactly the opposite sense.

Then in 1873, volume 7, I find on page 29:

At the request of Mr. Blake the resolution passed by the committee at the last meeting—that the committee cannot proceed without further instructions from the House was read. Mr. Blake moved that the said resolution be rescinded.

The resolution was lost in that instance, but the point is that in both those cases the resolution to rescind a previous motion was permitted as being in order. In one case it was carried; in the other case it was defeated.

There is a further precedent in 1882, page 122, when it appears that a latter committee which had not been given power by the House to call for persons, papers and records was given that power on its own subsequent recommendations to the House.

The CHAIRMAN: In that last case there was no previous decision by the committee against asking for that power?

Mr. FULTON: I cannot find the records of the committee's proceedings, but I think we are in somewhat the same position as they were.

A still later precedent which I have in mind occurred in 1946 in the Veterans Affairs committee where you, as chairman, entertained a motion the effect of which was to reverse a previous decision.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you give me the reference on that? It could be very persuasive with me.

Mr. FULTON: I have not got the page marked now, but I will look it up.

The CHAIRMAN: We have this notice of motion of Mr. Fulton. I will not say anything about it now, except that it is a very difficult question. I have looked into this from time to time in the past, and I realize the point raised is a very difficult one.

Mr. THATCHER: I am getting a little impatient with these motions, Mr. Chairman. We are having motions instead of getting down to consideration of the estimates. One would almost think that the Conservative party does not want this committee to succeed. It is true that going through these estimates is hard work and means a lot of plugging, and there may be no headlines attached to this hard work. But it is getting sickening, listening to so many motions of this kind.

Mr. MICHENER: It seems to me that the hon. member who makes that imputation entirely misconceives the purpose of these motions which are intended to make the committee more effective. It seems to me fairly obvious that if this committee is confined to what it can find out from talking to the minister it will not be able to do the same effective job as if we were able to bring people here from outside, and I do resent the suggestion made by Mr. Thatcher that the Conservative party has some ulterior purpose of diminishing the effectiveness of this committee simply because it is trying to enlarge the committee's powers. Our purpose is to extend the powers of the committee and thereby to make it more effective, not to confine it.

Mr. THATCHER: If Mr. Fulton does not want to do any work, let the rest of us do it.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Thatcher would be in a better position to say what he has if he had attended the meetings of our committee instead of being away for a week. He must know there was a matter before the committee which the committee agreed to hold while he was away. He of course must accept responsibility for any statement which he makes. These motions which I have made have been put forward in a logical sequence for the purpose of enabling the committee to call witnesses and obtain evidence. We have been told that the chairman takes the position at the present time that we are debarred from calling witnesses. I am therefore going to move a further motion for the purpose of removing the barrier. If Mr. Thatcher thinks that the knowledge in his own mind and at his own disposal is already complete, I would say he is in a much more enviable position than the rest of us, but we in this party feel this committee was set up to examine the administration of the department, and we do not want to preclude it from hearing the evidence of people who may assist us in our work, and if this means that our business will take a little longer, we in the Conservative party are prepared to sit here and do the work. We do not want to close it up and go home, or leave

in the middle. Mr. Thatcher's suggestions are entirely unwarranted, and I think the public which reads about these proceedings will draw the proper conclusions.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we have heard from two members on the Conservative side, and we have heard from Mr. Thatcher. I think we should hear from the other parties, if anyone wants to speak and then I think we should go on to consider the estimates.

Mr. DUPUIS: Would you call witnesses on the committee of supply? You would not call witnesses there.

Mr. FULTON: This is not the committee of supply.

Mr. DUPUIS: I know it is not, but the procedure should be the same.

Mr. FULTON: My understanding was that it was felt that the committee of supply was too cumbersome to enable it to get down to questions of detail. One of the limitations of the committee of supply is that it does not call witnesses. It is all done by the process of whispering between the minister and his officials, and my understanding is that these committees were set up for the purpose of enabling a more extensive and searching examination of the facts. If we are going to be bound by what happens in the committee of supply, we will be wasting our time.

Mr. DUPUIS: We could call 50 witnesses on Immigration, and 50 on the affairs of the other branch. When will we be through?

Mr. FULTON: If the committee should decide to call them. At the present time it cannot call anybody, by virtue of the chairman's ruling.

Mr. HELLYER: I think at the present time there is a scandalous waste of time on the part of Conservative members who are making these repetitious motions, and I hope they will cease making them.

Mr. FULTON: The Conservative party will continue to do what it can, within the rules of the House and of the committee, to make this committee effective, and it is perfectly clear that the committee is not an effective committee at the present time.

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): I would just like to support what was said by Mr. Thatcher. The impression I get as a member of this committee is this: this committee is something which was asked for for years and years by members of the Progressive Conservative party. Once a resolution was introduced into this House that the committee should be set up, however, they began to take an indifferent attitude. They worked for this committee for years and years, but from their attitude toward it now, I must say that in my own opinion, they appear to me making every effort to make the public believe that it is not of any use. That is the impression which I get here, and I think as Mr. Thatcher has said we have wasted a lot of time. There may be some members here who have a lot of time to waste. I have not. My time is fully occupied here in the House of Commons, and I would like to see us get along with the work, and accomplish something. We are not getting anywhere at present, and I strongly support the statement made by Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I have supported the attempts of the Conservative party members of the committee in their motions to change the formula on which this committee operates, because I agree wholeheartedly that the limitations placed on us hamper the work of the committee seriously. It is perfectly obvious, of course, that we are not going to get any help from the government's supporters in changing these rules. All we could do was to make an effective protest. This is one of the reasons which led me to support your ruling on the motion. Another reason is that, from my limited knowledge of procedure, it appeared to me, Mr. Chairman, that you were right. I think it is very regrettable that these gentlemen have not appeared before us,

and that the documents about which we have heard so much have not been placed before the committee, but I think the government and the Conservative party are to blame for that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to say one word to the committee about that. The documents will be delivered to the committee, as I indicated yesterday, the moment I receive a letter from Mr. Taylor saying he is willing to take personal responsibility for having me table them. I have two of the documents which have been referred to. He will have to send me the other two which have come into question, and the moment I get that letter, the documents will be placed on the table. So nobody can say, now, that anyone has responsibility except Mr. Taylor and his friends if these documents are not in front of the Committee.

Mr. HELLYER: I take it Mr. Fulton is in touch with Mr. Taylor. Has he advised Mr. Taylor of this generous offer?

Mr. FULTON: It is not up to me to do that. The hon. minister himself has been in communication with Mr. Taylor before.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have never been in communication with Mr. Taylor: To the best of my knowledge I have never seen him or spoken to him and I have never written to Mr. Taylor.

Mr. MICHENER: A lot could be said on Mr. Thatcher's 30 seconds. I think we should go on because I do not think we are getting anywhere by repeating these arguments.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think now the committee is fairly unanimous in thinking we should go on.

Mr. FULTON: I think it should be pointed out that Mr. Thatcher has wasted ten minutes of the committee's time.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we have got a unanimous decision that we should proceed, and that is not altogether a waste of time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I just wanted to give some information to the committee. I thought I had filed the answers to questions which Mr. Michener and one or two other members asked about the National Gallery, and I think now that one of the answers I filed is not really the answer to his question. It was a breakdown of the number of pictures in the Gallery—how many were Canadian pictures and how many were not. I have told the clerk to include this information notwithstanding, because I thought it was interesting, but I will try to get the proper answer as quickly as I can. Mr. Michener asked what proportion of the fund in the last two years had been spent on Canadian works of art and I will try to give him that information on Monday. There was another question asked, the answer to which I did not file because I did not locate the necessary document from the director until 11 o'clock last night. But he tells me in this document that the floor area required to meet the needs of the Gallery is 150,000 square feet, and the site on Elgin street measures 190 feet by 600 feet.

I think we gave all the information, when Mr. Abbott was examined yesterday, with regard to the questions which were asked with respect to the departmental administration. I was wondering if the committee would be disposed now to consider item 59 as carried and go back to the Immigration branch.

Mr. DUPUIS: I have one question before we finish with the National Gallery. The minister said that there is a great risk of fire in the present building. Why not speed up the construction of a new building? If we lose these works of art, we cannot replace them with money, as the minister said. Is there any reason why we should not proceed with that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is what we are trying to do. I am trying very hard to do that, and I have got myself a certain amount of notoriety because I tried to secure a site that some people apparently more powerful than I am were able to prevent the Gallery from getting. I think that we now have a site on which everybody can agree.

An Hon. MEMBER: On Elgin street?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Did you clarify the position on the immigration of farmers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a question on Immigration. Could we decide whether item 59 is carried?

The CHAIRMAN: The difficulty is that Citizenship comes under that too. It covers departmental administration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Citizenship is under items 60 and 61.

The CHAIRMAN: Departmental administration does administer Citizenship as well as Immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The committee could leave it open. Should we go right ahead to Immigration?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, items 66, 68 and 69.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
	IMMIGRATION BRANCH					
66	Administration of the Immigration Act	145	892,756	968,610	.....	75,854
68	Field and Inspectional Service, Abroad	148	1,832,494	1,835,259	.....	2,765
69	To provide, subject to the approval of Treasury Board, for Trans-Oceanic and Inland Transportation Assistance for Immigrants, including care en route and while awaiting employment	150	500,000	500,000		

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: A question by Mr. Cameron has been outstanding for some time, and I can now give an answer to it. He asked what authorities were responsible for the determination in Germany of who are refugees and who are not. I still have no answer in regard to Austria, but so far as Germany is concerned, it is the West German government. When people cross from behind the iron curtain into Germany, whether they are German nationals or other persons, they are screened by the West German authorities; some of them are classed as refugees and some are not. The ones that are classed as refugees are then regarded by us in exactly the same way as the people normally living in West Germany. That is to say, there does not have to be a two-year waiting period. We process and screen them just as we screen other people in West Germany. But if they are not classed by the West German government as refugees, then we have the two-year waiting period.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are you satisfied that the facilities of the West German government are adequate, in view of the fact that Dr. Otto John was the head of the internal security organization?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The fact that they say a person is a refugee does not mean that we will accept him. It means that we will process him immediately rather than wait for another two years.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do you make the same investigation?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We make the same investigation as in the case of a person who has always lived in West Germany. However, in the case of a German from East Germany who has not been classed by the West German authorities as a refugee, or in the case of someone from another country who has not been classed as a refugee, we have the two-year waiting period.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The West German government's clearance alters their status sufficiently in your eyes to permit of that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We consider that if they are satisfied that a person is a bona fide refugee, he can therefore, for our purposes, be considered on the same basis as someone living in West Germany. We know that there are many communists in West Germany, and we do not let them come to Canada if we can prevent it.

Mr. FULTON: There was a related question that was asked at the same time as Mr. Cameron's question. That is: who carries out the actual screening for us? It is not necessary to name the officials, but under whose authority is the security screening carried out which we wish to have applied to applicants in Germany and Austria?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Under the authority of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. FULTON: You told us that we do not have in Germany and Austria our own force, as it were, of security officers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that it is well known to the committee that my colleague the Minister of Justice, in his capacity as head of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, does detail certain officers of the force to go to Europe to assist us in this work. The mounted police, of course, have relations with other police forces. Everybody knows that. Beyond that I do not think that there is any further information that I can give to the committee.

Mr. FULTON: The point of the question was not to get details of how the security investigations are carried out, which information would be valuable to anyone seeking to evade them; but I think it was agreed that it would be in the field of proper inquiry for this committee to find out whether that work carried out by other authorities on behalf of the Canadian government is carried out by the West German government, or British intelligence authorities, or American, or whom?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, the officers of my department do not directly obtain any such information except from our own police. What our own police may do in this regard is, of course, the responsibility of the minister responsible for the police. I do not think it would be proper for me to attempt to describe that. In the first place, I do not know. The Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police takes the responsibilty for the information that he conveys to my deputy minister, and I do not go beyond that. I assume that the Minister of Justice has satisfied himself, and the government have satisfied themselves, and I am personally satisfied, that the commissioner is not only a competent police officer but one of the most competent police officers in the world. I do not attempt to substitute my technical capacity for his. Of course, it is known to the committee—and I do not want to evade any responsibility that is mine—that I have to take the responsibility for the final decision. That is to say, what we are provided with is information, and in the final analysis I am the one who has to answer to parliament for saying whether or not a person will be admitted. I tell the committee right now that

I sometimes do reach the conclusion, though not very often, that the information is such that I do not think, on balance, that the possible danger to the security of the state outweighs the other considerations in favour of admitting a person. That is particularly true in a case where a husband and wife are going to be separated or where a mother and child are going to be separated. Even though these people may belong to a class of persons that we do not want to have in this country if we can avoid it, in some particular instances the risk is not great and the inhumanity of maintaining the separation is great.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if the minister would go a little further in regard to family relationships. It seems to me that that is one of the cardinal principles for the administration of the Act, that families should not be separated if there is any reasonable means of keeping them together. Most of the difficulties of which I have heard from people in my constituency, in regard to immigration problems, result from the separation of families for security reasons or some other reasons of that kind. In the list which you have just now gone over, I should like to bring your attention to one omission, that is, the elderly or middle-aged parents of young Germans who have come to this country.

The CHAIRMAN: That is another question. Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Dupuis wanted to ask some questions.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to discuss Mr. Michener's point, because it is important, but I think that we should go on with this subject first.

Mr. DUPUIS: I have a question to ask the minister. What is the situation with regard to the opportunities of people living in Poland and Yugoslavia for coming to Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is very complicated to describe. Every time that I have attempted to describe it, I have tried to talk slowly and be as precise as possible, and I have never yet—although the Hansard reporter has got it down—seen anything appearing in print that is the same as what I said. I do not blame anybody. It is an inherently difficult subject to describe. In the first place, we think that anybody to whom the Polish governement gives a passport is likely to be prima facie a person whom we do not want. On the other hand, if a person can get out of Poland without a passport there is a greater probability that he is the sort of person whom we would be willing to take. That is a kind of rough rule-of-thumb. Now, the situation in Yugoslavia is further complicated by the fact that you have two kinds of communists in that country. There are the communists whom—since 1917 is sufficiently far away now—we may call the orthodox communists. We do not want these orthodox communists, if we can possibly avoid it. With regard to the others, the Yugoslav communists, I do not think that most Canadians would want very many of those. Then, of course, in between them are many genuine refugees. It really is a very complicated problem. Of course, the government of those countries, including Yugoslavia, are not anxious to help us identify and assist people who are hostile to their regime and tell us that they are hostile to their regime. They would not be anxious to give us the information that would enable this job to be done.

Mr. DUPUIS: Would you say that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the Poles who get out of Poland without passports are the only ones that would as a matter of fact be accepted here?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would say that that is true. However, I do not like to make many of these general statements about these matters, because the essence of this whole business is that you cannot generalize. You have to look at such facts as you can obtain, and such alleged facts as you can obtain, and try to make up your mind which are true and which are not true and what the real situation is.

Mr. HELLYER: Is there a general policy with respect to securing visiting visas for Yugoslavia?

Mr. C. E. SMITH (*Director of Immigration*): Not that I am aware of.

Mr. HELLYER: Each case would be treated on its individual merits?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. MCLEOD: We have been given quite a clear picture of the screening methods. Of course, the proof of any policy is in the results. I wonder if the minister could tell us, from the numbers of these doubtful cases of which he has been speaking, in how many cases it has been necessary for the Department of Justice to take action owing to the fact that these people have been subversive?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not really think that there have been any, but I do not know. We are preparing a return on a motion which somebody made in the House of Commons, about deportations. It was Mr. Noseworthy who made the motion the other day, and we are preparing a return to show the reasons for deportation. But my recollection is that the number who are deported because they are considered to be a danger to the security of the state is very low, if indeed there are any. The great majority of the deportations are on account of criminal records—what I call the ordinary, common or garden variety of criminal records—or of people who were prohibited persons when they came in and who concealed the facts.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Concerning the Yugoslavian question, I should like to raise another point before we move on to something else. I know that we agreed that we would not bring up specific cases, and I am not going to mention names, though I think that the minister will know the case that I mention. It is the case of a Yugoslav woman who was married to a Canadian resident when he was back in Yugoslavia some years ago. He was told—and I have on file a letter from our embassy in Belgrade—that in order to get his wife into Canada he would have to come back to Canada and make application here. Apparently he did, as the record says that he did that through the Toronto office of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He was a resident, and not a citizen?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There is no record that he was actually a citizen.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That would certainly be correct in the case of a resident.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Then he wrote to Ottawa and got in touch with one of my colleagues in the House, who wrote to you about it. Apparently this case was "put on ice" for a few years. I am not casting reflections on you or your department, but at the end you had a search made of the records and no trace was found of the information given you by my colleague. I wonder whether these cases come up periodically for review, or can they get lost in the files forever?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have been in this milieu for 17 years, and my experience is that almost anything can get lost in any files. I would not want to say for sure that some particular case might not. I have been conscientious in the performance of my duties for something over six months in the department, and I have yet to ask for a file which was adequately identified without getting it. Once in a while people get the names wrong and they may not have the circumstances right, and then the identification is quite difficult. I have known of one or two cases. I was very annoyed personally about one case where there was, in my judgment, a quite undue delay owing to the fact

that the file had been passed from one officer to another. It would have been very hard to establish blame. I think I made it quite clear that I was not pleased. But these cases have been very rare.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There was another aspect of the case to which I wanted to draw attention. It involved the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and also the External Affairs Department in that the approach was made to the embassy in Belgrade. There is a letter on file from one of the embassy officials. I was wondering what degree of correlation there is between the two departments. In reading this, one might almost get the impression—although I do not think it is the case—that either the embassy officials were not quite clear on what the regulations were or they had been feeding this man and his wife a cock-and-bull story to keep them quiet. They gave the impression that they were not quite frank with the man and his wife in Yugoslavia about the real possibility of getting into Canada. I wonder whether that would be possible, that our embassy officials might not know all the obstacles and might mislead people?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would hate to think that we had anybody in our embassies abroad who would deliberately mislead or even carelessly confuse an applicant. But I think that anybody who reads this document through two or three times a year but whose primary duties are very rarely related to immigration might quite innocently give information that is not entirely correct. I have tried very hard myself to learn everything that is in the Act and the regulations, but I am rather hesitant about giving opinions about these intricate cases without consulting the officials, because I find that about 25 per cent of the time my notion is not quite strictly right, that is the first notion that I have on a case.

The CHAIRMAN: Have we reached the point, Mr. Thatcher, where you can ask your question?

Mr. THATCHER: It is not on security.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton?

Mr. FULTON: I wanted to ask something about the minister's earlier reply to me. He outlined the principle that he follows in getting reports on security. I understand that, in effect, the minister said this is the responsibility of the R.C.M.P. although he stated that he must assume responsibility for the final decision. With regard to the cost of that process, the cost not only of R.C.M.P. officers who may be overseas but also any agencies that they may employ or that may assist them, is that reflected in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration estimates?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. I had better say that and no more. This is a service, in the same way as the service that we get from the Department of Public Works. There is no charge in any way. So the true costs of immigration are certainly higher than those reflected in the blue book, in so far as these security costs are not shown.

Mr. FULTON: May I ask this? Is it the case that in all countries which are in any sense major sources of immigrants to Canada, there are R.C.M.P. officers to assist in this work? Are there any countries where this department says that it is not necessary and that it will carry out the work itself?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In all the major countries there are. The deputy minister tells me that we do supply the quarters for the police and we pay local clerical help and things of that sort, but we do not pay police officers.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on this particular point of security, or can we now go to Mr. Thatcher's question?

Mr. MICHENER: The point I was raising really concerned security. It was about the elderly parents who are detained on security grounds.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The rule is that we do waive security. By this I do not mean that we would admit someone about whom we had information that he was really regarded as dangerous, but apart from that we do waive security on the parents, coming from behind the iron curtain, of legal residents of Canada, when those parents are over 65 years of age.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the rule-of-thumb, is it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. If the women are over 60 or the men are over 65.

Mr. MICHENER: In the middle-aged parent group, if there is a compromising record, it seems to me that in many cases that is capable of explanation by the necessities of the political situations through which they have come.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We try to take the best account that we can of that.

Mr. MICHENER: If there is any doubt, rather than keep the family separated by reason of one black mark or one suspicion, it would be a very humanitarian policy, at least where the parents are perhaps not of the age you have mentioned but getting toward that age, to give them the benefit of the doubt so as to make it possible to reunite families here. I have found that some of those immigrants that come here would be good citizens. They have come with at least one purpose in mind, of making a new home for their families and giving them some repose in their declining years and also getting their brothers and sisters here.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have tried to form a rough balance. Our inclination in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is to let the people come in. All our inclinations are in that direction. On the other hand, for perfectly obvious reasons, the Minister of Justice and the police are charged with the duty of doing everything they can to see that no unnecessary risks are taken with the security of the country. It may be, therefore, that they perhaps go a little further in this direction than some of the members of the committee would feel—and sometimes I feel—is really necessary, but not very often. It is no secret that when I was Secretary to the Cabinet I was the chairman of the security panel, and I have had quite a long experience in one way or another with this matter. I think it is only reasonable for me to say that my experience has been that the police are very discerning, and that I have found no evidence that they just say that there might be a slight chance and therefore we should not take the chance at all. They try to weigh all the circumstances and weigh them fairly. The officers with whom I have had to deal have been people with a good deal of what I would call understanding of what the historical process has been in the last generation in the world. These people know, perhaps better than we do, that someone living in the east zone of Germany has to pretend to conform in order to go on living. The fact that people sometimes join organizations of which we certainly would not approve is not necessarily taken as conclusive evidence, even by the police.

Mr. FULTON: I was wondering whether the minister would like to reconsider what he said a moment ago, because my recollection is that when I asked him in the House as to the chairmanship of the security panel I was told that that information could not be released, though of course most of us had a strong suspicion that it was he.

I think the attitude taken by the minister this morning is a much more realistic one than that taken by the House last year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, Mr. Fulton, I think that in this case we are probably both right. I remember Mr. Herbert Morrison during the war when he was asked a question of this kind—there was no opposition in

those days—he was the Home Secretary of the United Kingdom, but there were a certain number of people like Mr. Bevan who did not approve of the government in those times, and it was one of those people who tried to find out the names and composition of committees of the cabinet and Mr. Morrison replied that this matter was constitutionally secret, and he refused to give the information. The members of the House, of course, knew perfectly well what was the answer to these questions. We have one exception here, the statutory committee of the cabinet called the Treasury Board, and of course it is perfectly possible for people to find out who the members of that committee are. But strictly speaking under our constitution the existence of other committees of the cabinet is covered by the Privy Councillor's oath, and is secret.

Mr. FULTON: I understand however, that the committee was composed of people who were not members of the cabinet at all.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is perfectly correct, but I think the provision applies even more strongly in that case because if you disclose who are the advisers of the ministers who take responsibility, an unfortunate situation may arise. This is a subject on which I happen personally to feel rather keenly. I was for quite a long time in a position where it was sometimes suggested that I was responsible for various things happening, but I was forbidden by the proper conventions of our constitution from saying anything about it in reply. I made one vow when I became a politician, namely that nobody would ever get me to say a word in public in criticism of any civil servant. I would blame his political boss, and I think that is a good sound principle of our constitution.

Mr. FULTON: Very well, you need have no worry: we will always blame the minister.

Mr. DINSDALE: Just harking back to a previous statement of the minister with reference to the parents of Canadian citizens or new immigrants—is that a new policy or has it been in effect for some time?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It has been in effect for some time.

Mr. DINSDALE: It seems to be contrary to some of the experiences I have had with the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If you have any cases, Mr. Dinsdale, of women over 60 and men over 65 who are parents and you have had any different treatment of them, take them up with me and I will look into them.

Mr. HENRY: I would like to ask what the Red Cross is doing in relation to negotiating exit permits for people from behind the iron curtain. The minister made some statement to the effect that we did not know if they were going to accept entries from iron curtain countries.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As I understand it the Red Cross has been trying to find some of the children of Greek parentage who were taken away from their homes at the time of the Civil War in Greece, and carried off to countries behind the iron curtain and separated from their parents. Some of the parents have come to live in Canada and the Red Cross has been able to trace some of those children and they have been able to persuade the authorities in some of those countries to let some of the children leave, and we have in most of these cases waived the usual security requirements, because of the whole complex situation.

Mr. HELLYER: Does that apply to the wives of Canadian citizens who may have been taken captive at that time? Would the Canadian Red Cross help in situations like that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The deputy minister tells me that in the case of wives we normally waive security anyway. With regard to the other point, we are perfectly sure that if we tried to negotiate with any of those iron curtain countries ourselves we would get absolutely nowhere.

Mr. HELLYER: In other words the efforts of the Red Cross are laudable in your opinion?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The objects of the Red Cross are very laudable and we have tried to co-operate thoroughly with them, though of course you cannot be sure that some of these children may not have been completely indoctrinated. That is a risk we are taking, but we are taking it with our eyes open. Nobody has criticized us for doing it.

Mr. HELLYER: The age for children is under 21?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: May I refer Mr. Chairman, to item 69. I see the department is proposing to spend $500,000 this year on assisted passages. I also notice on page 150 of the estimates that in 1950, 1953, 1954 they only spent $98,000 and in 1954-55, $290,000. My question is this: has government policy changed in this regard? Why are they asking more this year than they did last year? It seems obvious to me that item has been "padded" to the extent of some $200,000.

Mr. FORTIER (Deputy Minister of Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Referring to this item of $500,000. It does not only represent trans-oceanic transport, it also covers inland transportation. Up to last year part of this was shown in the estimates of the Department of Labour, but this year the whole of the costs of inland transportation will be paid by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. THATCHER: In other words you actually think you will spend that money this year?

Mr. FORTIER: We estimate that the number of farm workers required—and this refers only to farm workers—will continue to be as many as was required last year.

Mr. THATCHER: So there would have been $200,000 under the Department of Labour last year.

Mr. FORTIER: I would not know exactly how much the figure was.

Mr. THATCHER: Then how could you arrive at this figure?

Mr. FORTIER: At the time we worked that out, we had the figures before us. It was estimated that there would be a certain number of farmers requiring farm workers, and that some immigrants would go west, where a good demand exists.

Mr. THATCHER: Has your policy on assisted passages changed at all? I thought you had possibly been allowing it to lapse.

Mr. FORTIER: There is no change in the policy of the assisted passage loans.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it would be useful to explain to the members of the committee just who are eligible for assisted passage loans.

Mr. MICHENER: That does not come under this item at all.

Mr. FORTIER: No. It is really under the Act, section 69. Nine million dollars are provided for assisted passages. This is not at all the same thing as what you call the assisted passage fund. This is to absorb the cost of inland transportation between the port of arrival and the place of destination in the case of farm workers who stay on the farm according to the understanding, for one year.

Mr. THATCHER: But you have had an item of $500,000 in for the last three years and you do not use it.

Mr. FORTIER: There is also included in that item provision for assistance to immigrants during their first year in Canada if for any reason they should need assistance from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. It may be that a man will temporarily lose his job. It may be he will need foor. It may be we will need to help him to reach a destination other than where he resides. Funds for use in such cases are all provided in that vote.

Mr. THATCHER: I am still not clear. You did not use this in the last two years, and since your policy is the same you are not likely to use it this year.

Mr. FORTIER: Two years ago we spent practically nothing, but we must be prepared to face these cases of emergency should they grow larger, and that is why we have to ask for this estimate—to provide the necessary money to meet such a situation as it arises. I cannot forecast exactly how many newcomers to this country will require the assistance of the department—for food and shelter, for instance, during the coming fiscal year, but the estimate made for the last years according to the economic situation of this country has been our guide.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can give you the expenditure, Mr. Thatcher, since 1950-51. In 1950-51 we spent $345,131; in 1951-52 we spent $1,189,822; in 1952-53 we spent $311,818; in 1953-54 it was $98,123. The forecast expenditure for this year is $200,000. You can see there is a marked variation from year to year.

Mr. THATCHER: Your forecast for this year is $500,000.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, the forecast expenditure is $200,000 for 1954-55. That is our expenditure. In addition to that of course in 1954-55 the Department of Labour has spent a considerable sum, but I cannot tell you what it is.

Mr. THATCHER: It is all to be amalgamated because the Department of Labour is not going to spend any more.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are not going to have any funds for it at all this coming year. Mr. Harris tried to get these two things combined, and he was never able to persuade the Department of Labour to combine them, but his persuasive powers apparently increased when he went to the place where he is now.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you attempt to recover this money from the immigrants, or do you write it off?

Mr. FORTIER: We explain to the immigrants that this is an advance to help them establish themselves, and if they return the money, there will be more in the "kitty" to help other men. Some are paying it back, and some are not.

Mr. THATCHER: What follow-up have you got?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is not a debt, Mr. Thatcher. The loans are, but they come out of the revolving funds. This covers the inland transportation of immigrants. Trans-oceanic transport, $100,000, would be exclusively for farmers—the deputy minister tells me I am wrong. This $100,000 is really an insurance policy, and we do not actually expect to spend it. Then there is another $150,000 for food and shelter in Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: How much of this do the immigrants actually pay back? How much did you get back last year from this item 69?

Mr. FORTIER: A very small amount, Mr. Thatcher, I do not have the exact figure, but I can get it for you. The money would be paid to the treasury.

Mr. THATCHER: Then it is really government policy not to try to collect this money?

Mr. FORTIER: I would not say we try to collect it, but we explain to the immigrant the advantage of returning the money when he can. We are not suing or pressing migrants for repayment.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is not the same as the loans for the assisted passage. We do try very hard to collect those.

Mr. FULTON: Your experience has been pretty good on that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It has been wonderful.

The CHAIRMAN: In the Public Accounts, CC-6, 1953-54. There is a vote apparently for $1½ million, $98,173 spent, and it says in a note underneath that the expenditures were not recoverable. If people want to pay these sums back, they can.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact I think some people do pay them back. There are some people who are only temporarily unemployed and in need of food and shelter who do not want to take assistance as a charity. They want to stand on their own feet.

Mr. DUPUIS: How are you forced to assist immigrant farm workers? These people are there on a job on a farm. Are you obliged to assist these people who are assured of finding a job when they arrive?

Mr. FORTIER: They are not necessarily destined to an individual person. We are trying to place them in employment according to opportunities as they may then exist, and in fact our experience is that they are usually successful in finding employment within ten days of their arrival.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That does not merely apply to farm workers. It applies to everybody who comes in under open placement. That is the difference between our way of dealing with farm labour, and that of the Department of Labour. The Department of Labour brought out people to fill specific jobs. We brought out people under a scheme of open placement.

Mr. DUPUIS: Would you assist an immigrant who leaves his job on a farm of his own accord before the expiry of his contract for one year?

Mr. FORTIER: I shall have to correct the impression which you may have on that matter. There is no contract for the immigrant. The only contract we have, if you want to call it a contract, is for the refund of the advance we make under this assisted passage loan scheme. That is the only contract an immigrant has with the department. People brought over for open placement are given this assistance on the understanding that they will settle in their line of occupation and try to remain there for a year.

Mr. DUPUIS: In the case of farmers, are they not bound to the contract?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If they stay for a year they do not have to pay the loan for inland transportation. That is an incentive for the farm labourer to pick a farm and stay on the farm for a year. If he does so he gets his passage free.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does that apply to women in domestic service?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It did for a while but it applies no longer. We decided that that was one place where some money could be saved this year.

Mr. THATCHER: How many people did you bring over on assisted passages last year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The director will have that.

Mr. MICHENER: Let us deal with this item first, and then perhaps we shall go on to discuss assisted passages. There are one or two more facts which I should like to have on this.

Mr. THATCHER: This has got to do with the trans-oceanic transport of immigrants.

Mr. FORTIER: Of the total amount we have in the estimate, $100,000, is an insurance policy to provide for any cases of urgent need which may arise in Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: I realize that, but can you give me the number for whom we paid?

Mr. FORTIER: None, since the last two years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am about as confused as you are, Mr. Thatcher, but as I understand it this would not be to pay the passage of individual immigrants, it would be to provide shipping to bring them over, or to provide air passages. Individuals would not get anything from this. It is put in here just in case there should be some need, but quite honestly we do not expect to spend any of that money.

Mr. THATCHER: Then why could we not take it out of the estimates?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, we were able to convince the Minister of Finance that it would be a good thing to leave it there in case some occasion arises when we might want to use it. We are not going to pay it to the C.P.R. or to the T.C.A. unless we need their services.

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Smith explained the other day that only two years ago they were fortunate enough to have a shipping organization called ICEM. This chartering costs nothing to the Canadian public or to the department. If we had not succeeded in getting that shipping, we would possibly have used this vote to get the immigrants who were in Great Britain at the time, and who could not get shipping to come to Canada; our ambition was to bring immigrants while the best conditions for employment exist.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to know how many immigrants were brought to Canada last year and the assisted passage loan.

The CHAIRMAN: Under what item in the estimates is that?

Mr. THATCHER: I think there is no item there. This is the nearest.

The CHAIRMAN: Just to clear that point up, that is a statutory provision, as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is voted as a fund, a revolving fund, and the immigrants pay back the loans and that repletes the fund.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be dealt with in a statement in the Public Accounts.

Mr. THATCHER: Questions on this assisted passage would come under item 62, however.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take Mr. Michener's question first, then.

Mr. MICHENER: I wanted to ask for the total of expenditures under this item during the last few years so that we might be able to see how much was spent on actual passages, and how much was used for paying rent for immigrants, and that sort of assistance.

The CHAIRMAN: In 1953-54. Inland rail transportation, $6,372; accommodation $91,800. That is in the Public Accounts.

Mr. MICHENER: Those are the only two main items of expenditure?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Except for the chartering of aeroplanes or ships.

Mr. MICHENER: The bulk of it was for accommodation, however?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: It would seem to me that this year with some unemployment, that there might be a greater demand on this than there has been in the past.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There does not seem to be any indication of that. For example in the week of February 18, we had 339 people receiving assistance. In the whole country it was only 339.

Mr. DINSDALE: I noticed the minister referred to food and shelter. Do I gather that no assistance is given with regard to clothing.

Mr. FORTIER: It would also cover clothing if it was considered that there was a need for it during the period.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Very few of them would need such assistance. The average immigrant has enough clothing to last him for the first year.

Mr. DINSDALE: I recollect a situation in Winnipeg where immigrants from southern climates ran into difficulty in facing a North American winter, and it was left to the responsibility of volunteer action to solve the problem. I was wondering whether there was any reason for your not having mentioned it though you did mention food and shelter.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact sponsored immigrants are supposed to be going to someone who is able to support them. They are all supposed to have enough to support themselves until they get employment. If those who have sponsored immigrants turn out to be unwilling to take their responsibility, we do not say that we would not look after an immigrant who had run into difficulty, though we would not of course expect to provide relief for sponsored immigrants in the normal course of things. It is only in the case of persons on open placement that we would normally offer to give relief, but, as I say, we do give relief in some of the other cases, though we do not like it.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is the demand for farm labourers continuing as strong as in previous years?

Mr. SMITH: Applications for farm workers are coming in a little stronger than they were at this time last year. There seems to be more optimism or, as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has explained it, the farmers are now getting back more to general mixed farming which requires a greater number of farm workers.

Mr. DINSDALE: Have they been available?

Mr. SMITH: Not as available as they have been in the past, but we still feel we can get a goodly number of the available farm workers.

Mr. THATCHER: In my area they are short of labour and the farmers cannot get labour, and it may be the department should step up the number of farm labourers it is bringing in.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is rather extraordinary, is it not, Mr. Thatcher that while we are spending days downstairs debating a "want of confidence" motion about unemployment we should have this testimony which Mr. Smith is giving us that the unsatisfied demand for farm labour is greater this year than it was a year ago.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is it possible that the continued demand is due to the rapid turnover in immigrant labour. What is the average length of time that a farm labourer immigrant stays on his job after arrival?

Mr. SMITH: The majority of the workers who have been brought out remain on the farm for at least a year, and many are remaining permanently and taking up farms of their own.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Last year I think we were pretty strict. The Federation of Agriculture had made some representations, and so had other interested bodies. I was told we had been accepting people as alleged farm labourers who had not actually been living on farms at the time they became immigrants, although they had been brought up on farms, and complaints were made that some of these people had lost their aptitude for farm work, and that only

genuine farm labourers were wanted, so we were very strict about it last year. I believe more of them stayed on the farm, but it made our job of getting them more difficult.

I was brought up on a farm myself, and it may be that if I went as an immigrant to, let us say, Australia, that I would not turn out to be a very good farm labourer, but I do not know whether we are not going to have a relapse this year and take some people who are not actually working on farms.

Mr. DINSDALE: You are trying to get more farm labourers?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Absolutely.

Mr. JUTRAS: One of the difficulties is that the farm workers who come do not fit into the picture of mechanized agriculture in the west. I know there is always a real demand for farm workers in our locality even when there are quite a number of men who are supposed to be farm workers waiting for employment in Winnipeg. What the farmers want more than anyone else are more mechanically skilled farm workers. They all have expensive farm equipment, the value of which runs into thousands of dollars and naturally they cannot put these machines into the hands of so-called farm workers who have no experience with them. Farm workers able to handle such machines are in great demand out west, but they are very hard to get. Personally, I have tried to get them and never had any success in that line.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, Mr. Jutras, that is a very great problem. My grandfather was an English immigrant farmer. He was only four years old when he came to Canada, it is true, but he said he would never have any green Englishmen on his farm, and it was for exactly the same reason that you have mentioned. My grandfather had the first self-binder in Norfolk County, and he was not going to let those Englishmen who thought they knew everything about them, but did not really understand them, experiment with his machines.

Mr. JUTRAS: I think that, when you direct farm workers, you could possibly direct—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: —the best ones to Manitoba?

Mr. JUTRAS: Instead of directing only farm workers, you could direct, say, drivers or mechanics. They would fit into the picture much better. During the harvesting season the salaries on these farms are paid by the hour. The hourly rate is very high.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Do they employ them for the whole year?

Mr. JUTRAS: No.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the real snag, is it not? We cannot offer a glowing picture of farming in Canada and say, "If you move here and come to Brandon or Moose Jaw on the 1st of March, we will give you very high wages until about the 1st of November, and then you can go into Winnipeg and see what you can do after that." That is a problem, and it is useless to pretend that it is not.

Mr. JUTRAS: But when the type of persons to whim I refer, such as truck-drivers and mechanics, are available in the city, should they not be directed to the country?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the National Employment Service ought to do that.

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is where it should be done. It would surely be better to look for unemployed Canadians, if there are such in those categories. It is not a very good immigration practice to bring people in here for seasonal work, except for the harvest workers out west who come from Texas, or used to.

Mr. GARLAND: Am I correct in assuming that under the open placement scheme there is not now and never has been a definite undertaking given by the immigrant to stay on the farm for one year?

Mr. FORTIER: The Department of Citizenship and Immigration never had that undertaking.

Mr. DUPUIS: During the war?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We did not bring them in then.

Mr. FORTIER: The Department of Citizenship and Immigration has existed only since the 18th of January, 1950.

Mr. JUTRAS: It would be the Department of Labour?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The Department of Labour. I do not think that any of us could attempt to give any answers about that. We really do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thatcher was asking about assisted passages. On page 26 of the annual report is a statement that shows the following:

> Since the assisted passage scheme was inaugurated in February 1, 1951, a total of 28,386 had taken advantage of its terms, and at the end of the fiscal year a total of $4,155,634.91 had been advanced and $3,895,878.47 recovered from 19,335 immigrants who had repaid their advances in full.

So the committee can see that the total of the advances has been paid up to within $300,000. I think that that is a wonderful record.

Mr. THATCHER: I was going to ask the minister what the policy is with regard to assisted passages. Is it relatively the same this year as in the past?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes, it is the same this year as in the past.

Mr. THATCHER: To what classes of immigrants will you give assisted passages?

Mr. FORTIER: Assisted passages are given to domestics, farm workers, nurses' aides, and in Great Britain and France anyone who would be in the position that his services would be required in Canada and would be unable to pay his passage to this country.

Mr. THATCHER: They would just have to make application for it?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you find that more want the services than there are funds available for that purpose?

Mr. FORTIER: No, we have sufficient money now.

Mr. DINSDALE: I believe that assisted passages are granted on an individual basis?

Mr. FORTIER: That is correct.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is there no chance for a family to move as a group?

Mr. FORTIER: We advance the fare to the breadwinner, or any worker in the family above 18. For instance, in the case of sugarbeet workers, if a person of 19 or 20 is part of the family and coming to work in Canada he will receive the assisted passage.

Mr. MICHENER: Why do not British immigrants make more use of assisted passages? I notice that they are not among the larger groups that receive assistance.

Mr. SMITH: When we opened up the assisted passage scheme there were a considerable number of British immigrants that did apply. If we saw that a person who was coming over did not have sufficient funds to pay for his whole transportation, we helped him out. We were stricter in so far as German immigrants were concerned. Lately there has been an improvement in British

economic conditions, hence fewer requests for assistance. Some immigrants went back, who were more or less joyriders. When it became evident that they had to pay back the money which they had received for the assisted passage, the result was that fewer applied. We have not been receiving as many requests for assisted passages as we had in the years 1952 and 1953.

Mr. MICHENER: Could you give us the figures, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, the total number of warrants issued in the calendar year 1954 was 2,362, out of which 274 were issued in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, and 26 in Ireland.

Mr. MICHENER: Could you go back two years more, so that we could see the change and why it had come about?

Mr. SMITH: I am afraid that I do not have the figures here.

Mr. HENRY: Have you the figures on those who went back, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH: I will have to obtain that information.

Mr. FULTON: It has not been as widely used in the case of immigrants from the United Kingdom as in the case of those from the continent of Europe. Is the reason for that not found largely in the fact that, as you have pointed out, it is available only to the breadwinners of the families and not to the minor members of the families; and also to the fact that in the United Kingdom, while there was very extensive war damage and so on, there was not disruption of family life to anything like the same extent as there was on the continent? There are more people on the continent who are single and independent and have no family ties and would therefore be more ready to take advantage of the assisted passage as individuals than is the case in the United Kingdom.

Mr. SMITH: I do not think that that would necessarily apply. As many families come from the continent as from the United Kingdom. I think that the difference is that on the continent of Europe they had absolutely no funds whatsoever. Once the British immigrants discovered that this was a loan, not a grant, and that it had to be repaid, it was then found that the majority of those applying had sufficient funds, owing to the improvement in economic conditions in the United Kingdom. I am quite satisfied that the number that were applying became quite aware of the fact that this money had to be repaid on arrival in Canada out of their wages, and that they then decided that it was better not to apply for assistance but to use their own money.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There would be an exchange advantage, too. The passage may be paid in sterling, whereas if we advance it they have to pay it back in Canadian dollars. If they had any sterling balances, using them to pay for their passages would be a way of maximizing what they could take out of the country.

Mr. FULTON: Would it not be correct to say that there would be more single persons on the continent of Europe, because family ties have been disrupted, than there would be, proportionately to the rest of the population, in the United Kingdom? In the U.K., although they suffered to some extent from war damage, as I say, they did not have the complete disruptions and shifts of families. There was not the same breakup of the family unit in the United Kingdom as on the continent. Would that not be a correct statement?

Mr. SMITH: It may be correct as far as displaced persons are concerned, but since December, 1951, when the I.R.O. went out of existence, we have been dealing with German nationals and Austrian nationals along with the refugees. I think that there are as many family units, if not more, applying from the continent as from the United Kingdom. We have a number of single persons from the United Kingdom. You would be right in regard to the earlier days.

Mr. FULTON: Now, of course, as you mention, it may be that the economic recovery of the United Kingdom has to some extent made the prospect of emigration less attractive than it was previously. Maybe they recovered earlier than the more war-torn parts of the continent. Admitting for the sake of argument that would be a reason why the general level of emigration would decline, it is made a more compelling reason when you consider that the assisted passage scheme is applied only to the breadwinner. If he is a family man, he has to contemplate coming out and staying for about two years before he can pay the fare to bring his family out, whereas if he stays home he has a job and keeps his family together. If I am correct in my assumption that there is a bigger proportion of unattached persons on the continent of Europe as a result of the war than there is in the United Kingdom, it seems that that would go quite a long way toward explaining why more took advantage of our assisted passage scheme on the continent than in the United Kingdom. After all it is asking quite a lot of a man to say: "I will assist you to come out, but you have got to get established and earn enough money to pay for your family to come out." He has to contemplate a two or three-year separation from his family when he comes to Canada, whereas he would be able to maintain his family unit, at least, if he were in the United Kingdom. But that would not apply, of course, in the case of the person who came from some country in Europe which had been badly affected by the war, and who did not know where his family was.

Mr. SMITH: You can tell from the statistics how the numbers are going down. You can see it from the number of warrants we have issued in the past two years. In Germany the total issued there was 1,198, and in Austria 370. This is very much lower because of the economic improvement in Germany and in Austria. Our records show that the average immigrant from the continent is in a position to bring over his family and dependents within six months of arrival. In so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, we have not kept as close check on that, but I would think the average would be pretty close to six months, that is the length of time which passes on an average between a man's arrival and the time when his family joins him.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: After all, these passages are not terribly expensive, and if a man gets a good job here it does not take him very long to save up enough money to bring his family over.

Mr. DINSDALE: These assisted passages I understand are available to farm workers and domestic staff.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: On the continent of Europe. But with regard to France and the United Kingdom they are available to anyone who comes for open placement.

Mr. DINSDALE: What countries supply most of the farm workers and domestics?

Mr. SMITH: Netherlands and Germany.

Mr. FULTON: I think this may possibly be wandering from the field of our discussion, but arising out of what Mr. Smith has said, I wonder why we in Canada are not taking advantage of participating in what I think is described as the British Commonwealth immigration scheme under which the United Kingdom and parliament will make available to immigrants proposing to go to any Commonwealth country which wishes to participate in the scheme, a grant or a loan to assist in the passage. Under this scheme you have two governments involved. You have the Commonwealth country to which the immigrant is going, and you have the United Kingdom government, and I understand they renewed that Act a couple of years ago for a further five-year period, and that Australia in her drive for British immigrants is using it

extensively, and that there is a considerably greater measure of assistance to the immigrant himself under this plan than there is under our assisted passage scheme.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if Mr. Fulton would take any objection if I regarded that question as notice. I would like to give consideration to giving the answer concisely. I have a memorandum on this subject which I think is rather longer however than I need trouble the committee with. It is of course a matter of policy. I do not want to be difficult about that, but I would like to give the answer as briefly as I can.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry 69 now?

Mr. DINSDALE: Pursuing the reply Mr. Smith gave particularly in reference to agricultural workers, is France not a potential source of supply, and how about Italy?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: France is certainly not. There is a chronic shortage of farm labour in France.

Mr. MICHENER: Looking for immigrants itself?

Hon Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, the birth rate took a decided turn about 1940 for mysterious reasons which I could not possibly explain, just as it did here and that is why no one is going to get me to make predictions about the probable population of this country in 20 years time. But France has a permanent deficiency of agricultural workers.

Mr. DINSDALE: How are Italian immigrants classified?

Mr. SMITH: In the past few years the number of applications we have been receiving in our Rome office for close relatives fully occupies our staff, and I would have members of the committee know that the staff is working and has worked throughout the summer months up to nine, ten and eleven o'clock every day in the week except Sunday. We felt here that we were breaking the health of our officers, to the point where it was decided there would be no more unreasonable overtime. The applications received, as I said, from close relatives up to the end of 1953 last year fully occupied our staff. In 1954 it was decided that once the backlog of close relatives had been disposed of, we would be in a position to select categories of our own choosing, and we were given permission to do so for the first time last year by the Italian authorities, that is to select certain classes and occupations. Unfortunately the tentative figure we had agreed upon became known to the general public in Italy through the press with the result that in January of last year we got 135,000 applications, and February over 200,000, so that our staff and records were completely disrupted and once again our staff had to work continually. However, we were able to take approximately half of those under the open placement, which we had formerly indicated we would, due to the fact that during the year there was another upsurge in the number of applicants for close relatives and this year 1955 again we shall not be able to take as many on open placement as we did in the year before, because of the increase in applications for close relatives which have kept our staff and facilities fully occupied in Italy.

Mr. DINSDALE: I presume, Mr. Smith, that the upsurge of applicants for close relatives is related to the heavy influx of Italian immigrants during the past few years?

Mr. SMITH: It is the close relatives who present such a great problem because they are so large in numbers. There are many villages in Italy which are completely depopulated, because all their inhabitants are now in Canada. The families are so large that we do not see the end.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I may say, speaking personally, that if we could find some way to get some people for open placement from Italy and if we could give priority to some of them over the close relatives—some way which

would not outrage the feelings of Canadians—I think it would probably be a sound Immigration policy, but it is very hard to see how we are going to give priority to other people over close relatives and I do not know any practical way of doing it. Nevertheless it would certainly be desirable in those occupations where we thought there were particular opportunities for those skilled in them to find useful employment.

Mr. FULTON: Would that not involve a shift in the region of origin of immigrants from the south to the north of Italy?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would. I did discuss the possibility of moving our office from Rome to Milan. Practically all the other governments which have immigration offices in Italy, have their offices in Milan. I understand that the Australian government, for example, has its office there. But I am told it would only add to the expense of those close relatives who are seeking admission to Canada in coming to our office to deal with applications, and I would not want to do that. If any member of the committee could make any suggestion or throw on any light on this matter, I should be glad to hear from him.

Mr. DINSDALE: I have not quite got the answer I was looking for. The demand for the admission of close relatives is connected I presume with the influx of agricultural workers from Italy in 1952 and 1953.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have never taken anybody but close relatives from Italy ever since the war. It is an endless chain.

Mr. MCLEOD: If Italy is considered a good source for immigrants, why not enlarge our facilities?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You know, Mr. McLeod, that there was a long debate downstairs about the phrase which Mr. Mackenzie King used in his statement of 1947 about not altering the fundamental composition of the Canadian population, and there is plenty of room I admit for interpretation of the meaning of that statement, but I myself am of the opinion that we have a certain kind of society here in Canada with certain political and social institutions which we have developed, and there are some sources of immigrants from which we get people who adapt themselves more quickly and more readily to the kind of society which I think we want to preserve, than others. I do not say this in any way as a reflection on the Italian immigrants. I think a lot of us have been far less than fair to these Italian immigrants. Sometimes I almost feel like "sticking my neck out" and saying that by and large the Italians seem to be almost the last people in western Europe who are really willing to work hard at the disagreeable jobs which have to be done if society is to survive.

Mr. HELLYER: Very true.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We should not turn our noses up at these people. I would like to think that the people who do come are fitting well in to our economy, as well as into our society, and I do think that if we went beyond a certain number, if that number became disproportionate, we should really be facing a problem within Canada; it would be bound to create a certain "shift" which I do not think the public would want. We want those Italians who do come to be Canadians, and to be welcome and to fit in to our society, and only so many can come from any country and fit in and be welcomed into our society at one time.

Mr. HENRY: Those who have come here—have they fitted in?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think most of them have. We find a few Italian Canadians in court charged with criminal offences, but I have paid some attention since I have been in the cabinet to the names of the people sentenced

to be hanged. As members of the committee know, every person who is sentenced to be hanged has his case reviewed by the cabinet, and I have noticed that a surprising number of the names are good old English names.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to refer to certain papers—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We seem to have got off the subject of assisted passages, and on to the general administration of the Act. Just to make me a little happier, could approval be indicated and number 69 be passed?

Carried.

Mr. MICHENER: I thought we had passed that on March 3.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is two items we have got passed.

The CHAIRMAN: We have got item 67 carried and 61. What about 68, may it now carry?

Mr. MICHENER: I want to ask for some papers. Although we have no power to send for papers there are two or three I would like to have from the former session. One was an attempt to divide the Canadian field staff between those whose main duty is getting information about employment and those who are on the side of the placement and handling of immigrants. Another, which I asked for this morning, was about assisted passages from the United Kingdom. The other question which I want to ask at the next meeting is on item 68, if the information can be obtained without too much difficulty: what is the location of the overseas field offices, and what is the size of each of the agencies in each of the countries.

Mr. SMITH: I can answer the first question right away. The number of officers engaged in placements totals 139. As you will recall, in a previous statement, I made the answer "approximately 115." Would you like the names of the officers?

Mr. MICHENER: No. The rest of them, I take it, are engaged in obtaining employment and statistics.

Mr. SMITH: No. These officers are the ones engaged in development placement, settlement and investigation work.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The greatest bulk of them are patrolling the border, right from the place where Mr. Stuart comes from, I think that he is the eastermost member to the Pacific coast.

Mr. FULTON: Did I understand you to say, Mr. Chairman, that item 67 was carried?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, item 67 was carried some time ago.

Mr. FULTON: When?

The CHAIRMAN: The 3rd of March. We carried items 67 and 69.

Mr. FULTON: We carried item 69 this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 67 was carried on the 3rd of March.

We will meet again on Monday at 3:30 p.m. in this room and on Tuesday at 10:30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Does the committee think that we will spend all of Monday on immigration, or is there some hope of bringing up Citizenship Registration on that day?

Mr. FULTON: I think that immigration should be about finished.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I should ask Mr. Duggan to come, just in case.

The CHAIRMAN: Adjourned until 3:30 p.m. on Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel, and Mr. J. E. Duggan, Registrar.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55163—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.,

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, March 14, 1955.
(12)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, McLeod, Monteith, Pickersgill, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. E. S. Smith, Director of Immigration; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel; and Mr. J. E. Duggan, Registrar.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Immigration Branch.

Mr. Pickersgill and his officials supplied information and statistics and were questioned thereon.

Mr. Monteith moved, seconded by Mr. Fulton,—

That the Estimates of the Immigration Branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, amounting to $8,874,205,00 be reduced by 5% or by an amount of $443,710.00.

The motion was resolved in the negative on the following recorded division:

Yeas: Messrs. Dinsdale, Fulton, Monteith and Yuill.—4.

Nays: Messrs. Byrne, Deschatelets, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Jutras, Lafontaine and Pickersgill.—7.

Items numbered 68 and 66 were adopted.

At 5.50 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m., Tuesday, March 15.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

55163—2

EVIDENCE

MONDAY, March 14, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen. We have a quorum and we will proceed.

We are on items 66 and 68 of the estimates.

Hon. John W. PICKERSGILL (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, even though Mr. Michener is not here at the moment, to give one bit of information which I did not give before about the National Gallery. I have here a memorandum which sets out that during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1954, the National Gallery purchased the following:

Important European paintings, 12, at a cost of $513,293. That included paintings from the Liechenstein collection as well as some others. Then, Canadian paintings, 6, $3,275. During the period April 1, 1954, to date the following works of art have been purchased or approved for purchase by the board of trustees: important European paintings, 2, at a cost of $118,550; Canadian paintings and sculpture, 41, at a cost of $19,080. Then there is an added note that:

> The board of trustees approved the holding of a National Gallery Biennial Exhibition of Canadian works of art including paintings and sculpture. This exhibition is an effort to enable the National Gallery to consider for purchase the best examples of contemporary Canadian works of art. At the meeting of the trustees held last October, additional ways and means of acquiring Canadian works were discussed, and it was agreed that the chief curator should spend a certain amount of time travelling throughout Canada, seeking works in exhibitions and artists' studios in the more important centres. Such selected works would be submitted to the trustees for purchase.

I think that goes a little beyond what I undertook to give Mr. Michener.

I also promised Mr. Fulton I would give an answer to a question which I wanted to give a little thought to answering.

Mr. FULTON: On this point, if it is felt this is getting into the realm of policy I must say that I would have to agree to that. So, if it is not desirable to get into a discussion at this time, but wait until the estimates are back in the House, I would not raise an objection.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have no objection. As a matter of fact it is one of the questions which is right on the borderline between policy and administration. I am entirely in the hands of the committee. If the committee would like me to give the reason why we do not avail ourselves of this British scheme and then discuss the merits of those reasons I would be very happy to have the discussion because I do think it is a matter of real interest to a section of the public.

Mr. BYRNE: It seems to me that the question has been asked in the committee and if the minister feels he is at liberty to give the answer we might as well have it here.

Mr. FULTON: I do not want to get part way into it and then have somebody say it is a matter of policy and should not be further discussed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would hope that no one would do that.

I have before me what the experience was under the United Kingdom Empire Settlement Act of 1932 which was re-enacted in 1937 and again re-enacted in 1952 and under which we operated before the war and under which we have not operated since the war. Canada entered into agreements during the years between 1922 and 1932.

Mr. THATCHER: What is the question we are discussing.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Why do we not take advantage of the United Kingdom legislation for the assistance of emigrants from the United Kingdom to other commonwealth countries of which the Australian government does take advantage and of which no other commonwealth countries now take advantage. Mr. Fulton raised the question as to why we did not take advantage of this legislation. There were 12 agreements I am told between 1922 and 1932, and I do not think there is much point in the committee cross-questioning me about the historical material. I am not an expert on it and will not know the answers beyond what is in this document. There were 12 agreements made providing some form of financial assistance and during this scheme assistance was available to the following classes of immigrants: agricultural families for land settlement, agricultural families for farm work, single farm laborers, houseworkers, wives and families joining family heads established in Canada otherwise than on the land, and juveniles.

If I might interpose a little of my own biography, I was an impecunious undergraduate at Oxford when this scheme was in operation and I was lucky enough, when I wanted to come home from Oxford in 1929 and had no money, to be able to take advantage of this scheme myself by being appointed guide, philosopher and friend of a group of these juveniles.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps that is why the scheme was discontinued.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is about the limit of my personal knowledge of the scheme.

Mr. Smith has been in the department a very long time and has given me the benefit of some of his experience with it.

Between April 1923 and December 1925 the assistance to adults was by way of loan. From January 1926 until December, 1931, the adult was given a reduced ocean passage and a reduced rail fare in Canada while children belonging to agricultural families and juveniles continued to receive free transportation, both ocean and Canadian rail. While the basis of financial contributions was a 50-50 basis, it turned out that Canada's actual financial contribution far exceeded that of the United Kingdom due to the fact that loans were made to the extent of roughly $1,022,000 odd, of which more than $200,000 is still outstanding—and I would guess it is pretty largely uncollectable. In addition to the above cost Canada incurred all the cost of after care which was not equated by the British government between 1923 and 1925. Between January 1, 1926 and 1932 the cost of Canada's after care was $2,300,000 odd. I may say that I think very few people were brought under this scheme after 1932. I am told that there were none. It will be remembered during those years the migration was the other way. Actually, Canada's expenditures on administration and aftercare exceeded the British government's larger cash contribution to transportation by the sum of $1,545,000 odd. Even with those extra costs the story is not complete because Canada incurred heavy cost in looking after trainees, in investigational work and in bringing about deportations.

So far as assisted passages were concerned, the principle of a 50-50 contribution did not work out in practice and the heavy burden fell upon Canada. The overall cost was more than 50-50. I do not personally consider that as an

objection. It seems to me if we have immigration it is because we think there is a benefit to Canada from it and we should expect to pay the larger share of it. But the real objection of course, one has to look at it in the context of those times—the real objection was that in those times, when work was very difficult to get, especially toward the end of that period, on both sides of the Atlantic—although in the earlier part it was not so difficult on this side—this scheme brought to Canada quite a considerable number of people who, for one reason or another, do not seem to have been able to look after the obligations they undertook. I do not know whether this is greatly to our credit, but it is a fact that during the early thirties a great many of these people were deported from Canada for no other reason than that they had become public charges. That was part of the economic climate of that time, and I am not founding an argument on that. What the department believes is that this cheap mode of transportation encouraged many immigrants not of a very serious type to come here. A disproportionately high number were not able to adapt themselves to the country and were not able to get along here. Of course, during the latter part of that period we restricted them largely to farmers and farm workers; and many who said they were farm workers, if they went on a farm at all, stayed there for very little time. The general experience was that, by and large, the type of immigrant attracted by this scheme was not the best type of British immigrant. I do not want anyone to think that I mean that all of them were like this, but perhaps the attractiveness of this scheme resulted in bringing a certain number who were not.

In my view, this is not the real objection to our doing anything about this now. It seems to me that the financial relationship between Canada and Great Britain during the war and since the war is such that we would be entirely lacking, in this second half of the twentieth century, in self-respect, if we asked the British taxpayers to assist us in carrying out our immigration program. My own view—and I think this view is shared by my colleagues—is that whatever form of assisted passage we want to have, the Canadian taxpayers should pay for it themselves; and that, of course, has the added advantage that then we will have the sole say in the selection. We cannot expect the government of another country, answerable to another parliament and to another set of taxpayers, to pay out money to assist migrants unless it has some say in who is selected. When the Act was reenacted in 1952, I find that the maximum contribution from the United Kingdom was cut from half a million pounds to £150,000. It was stated that the reasons for this reduction were the financial situation and the imperative need for economy in government expenditure. So far as I am concerned—and I think I speak for the whole government in saying this—I would rest my case right there. We do not think, in this post-second-world-war period, that it would be self-respecting for the Canadian taxpayers to try to fob off on the British taxpayers part of the cost of a policy which is primarily designed to build up this country, and if we are not willing to bear that cost ourselves we should not expect anyone else to bear it.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you think that you would get more immigrants if you did?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I do not think so, Mr. Thatcher. It seems to me that, if there is something wrong with our own assisted passage scheme, we should change it. It seems to me that that would be a more valid line of criticism, rather than the criticism that we are not taking advantage of this very small amount of money that the United Kingdom government now feels like asking their parliament for. It seems to me that if we do not think that we are getting the maximum return that we want to get from our present

assisted passage loan scheme, we should do something about it ourselves and not ask some other government to do it.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps that raises the point that is at issue and that I was trying to get at last week. I understand that the British Commonwealth scheme—is that the correct name?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is called the Empire Settlement Act.

Mr. FULTON: Does that scheme make money available for moving family units?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Whereas our assisted passage loan scheme does not?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As I read it here, it was what we took advantage of. I have not the whole of the details of the scheme at my fingertips, but before the war we took advantage of this for wives and children joining heads of families established in Canada otherwise than on the land.

Mr. FULTON: I think that probably most people would agree with what the minister said as to the Canadian nation not taking advantage of something which will be of benefit to it, at the expense of the British taxpayer. But in my view what has been said, and what the minister said towards the close of his explanation a few moments ago, indicates that if there is an amendment to our own assisted passage loan scheme that might be suggested, it would be along the lines of making this assistance available for the movement of families.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be very glad to consider the arguments for that at any time. The other day Mr. Smith indicated—and again I defer to his much greater experience—that he did not feel that that would have very much effect and that our experience with people who had taken the assisted passage loans was that it was only about four or five months before they were able to bring their families.

Mr. C. E. S. SMITH (*Director of Immigration*): Six months, on an average.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It seems to me that, as long as we are going to stick to loans, there is not apt to be very much advantage. Actually most people—and particularly is that true of immigrants from the United Kingdom who are coming here to look for jobs—are surely better off to come by themselves and get a job and a place to live before they bring their families out.

Mr. FULTON: Would you not admit that there is a psychological, and perhaps a practical, physical obstacle as well, to a person well established in a position in the United Kingdom—in a position which enables him to keep his family together as a unit—who may nevertheless be a most desirable immigrant from the point of view of Canada, where the only assistance he can get—he probably cannot afford to come entirely on his own and is looking for assistance—the only assistance he can get is one which imposes on him the necessity of leaving his family behind? Though it is true that he may be a man who is prepared to take a considerable chance—and that is the kind, I think, that we want—when a man has incurred family obligations you are imposing a considerable psychological, as well as a practical difficulty in his way when you say, "We will help you to go out, but your family cannot go out until you yourself can pay their passage and look after them."

On the other hand, if we still put it on a repayable loan basis as at the present time, but extend it so that it would cover the cost of bringing his family out so they could be re-united sooner than he thinks now he may be able to, it would encourage a greater volume of immigrants, and of desirable types of immigrants, from the United Kingdom.

To reinforce my argument, may I point out that Australia, as the minister himself said, is using the Empire Settlement Act, and it is difficult to agree that the experience under it is universally bad when statements have been placed on record from the Australian government to the effect that they are renewing their efforts to get British immigrants and are, in fact, apparently succeeding. In other words, they have used this scheme in the past and they have found it satisfactory, and they are redoubling their efforts to get immigrants under this scheme, as well as by other methods.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would not want to say the slightest word in criticism of what the Australian government is doing. Members of the committee are all very familiar with the fact that a passage to Australia costs at least three times as much as a passage to Canada. So far as immigrants to Canada are concerned one way in which they can "maximize" the amount of sterling they can bring with them out of the United Kingdom, is by paying their passage in sterling over and above what they can take out.

So long as this is a loan and not a gift, the actual incentive would not be very great because I would not think many people would want to incur any extra debts especially when they were establishing themselves in a new country. There may be some cases such as Mr. Fulton suggests, but I do not think there are very many because there are not very many indigent immigrants or immigrants near that level coming to Canada. The fact is there are not very many indigent people in the United Kingdom nowadays in the category of persons who would be coming here as immigrants, particularly as we do not encourage people who might be within this category to come.

Mr. FULTON: There may be very few indigent people in the United Kingdom, and probably most people there have a job and their family arrangements are satisfactory; but that is a very different thing from saying they should be able to accumulate the necessary savings to bring their families out with them, because it is still an expensive thing to travel with a family say, from the United Kingdom to the Pacific coast of Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should be very glad to give this matter some further consideration. It is obviously something I cannot decide myself; I should have to get authority from my colleagues for it; but if I were really confident that this would actually bring substantially more people of a desirable type here, I should be all for it. Of course, I do not think it should be applied only to the United Kingdom. The opportunity ought to be available to all if they are good immigrants.

Mr. FULTON: Yes, the same facilities should be extended on a general basis, I quite agree, but I have a feeling it would have the result of bringing over more immigrants and desirable immigrants from the United Kingdom. Is the minister familiar with the work done by, and the representations made from time to time by the British Empire Immigration Society — I believe that is the name—in Montreal, through Mr. Girton?

Mr. SMITH: The British Dominion Immigration Society.

Mr. FULTON: If he is going to give this matter further consideration, I recommend he get in touch with Mr. Girton who will I know be very glad to discuss these matters with him.

Mr. THATCHER: I have a question I would like to bring to the minister's attention, but before I do that I should like to comment on this matter. I myself cannot agree with the minister that this plan may not be desirable. I rather like it for two reasons—it may save the Canadian taxpayer some money, always an important consideration with me, and in the second place we may get some more immigrants by using it. I do not see why we should

not use both the assisted passage scheme, and this scheme now being discussed. We need not be too proud to use it; if the British did not want us to use it, they would not have set the scheme up at all. I think this is a policy change to which we might well give consideration. British immigration has been falling off for some time, and this scheme may help to revive it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: A dollar is a dollar, no matter whose pocket it comes out of, and there is only £150,000 there.

Mr. THATCHER: They must obviously consider that this is good expenditure in Birtain or they would not have the scheme in being. However, I would like to ask the minister this: one of the problems, I understand, that the British immigrant is faced with is the problem of getting out exchange, and I am wondering if the department has made any representations to the British government recently in an effort to get them to ease the regulations which govern this matter. I think we could get more immigrants out here if they could bring out more sterling and change it into dollars.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that is a point. I believe it is a much more real obstacle than that of finding a passage. We have made representations, and the British government in its wisdom has made considerable relaxations in the exchange regulations.

Mr. THATCHER: Could you give us the details?

Mr. SMITH: I would prefer to table them and give them accurately, but as near as I can recall, immigrants from the United Kingdom may now bring with them a maximum, at the time of their arrival, of 2,000 pounds sterling. The head of the family is allowed 1,000 pounds and each dependent 250 pounds up to a total of the 2,000 pounds I spoke of. We found in a survey we made in the United Kingdom in 1950 where we checked Bank of England accounts, that there were not too many people there who had available for transfer a sum of 1,000 pounds at that time. There are a few who have far more than that, and ways and means have been provided for such people to bring more money over provided they are engaged in industry or business in Canada. So the result of the easement of exchange regulations will not in our view be the means of any great increase in the number of Britons who come.

Mr. THATCHER: It would increase it to some extent?

Mr. SMITH: It would increase the number to some extent, it is quite true, but not to the extent expected by the majority of people unfamiliar with the situation.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We would of course like to have the restrictions removed altogether.

Mr. THATCHER: Have we made any representations lately asking that the restrictions should be removed?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was mentioned that they might be reduced. I talked to Lord Swinton about it when he was here. It is a subject on which the United Kingdom government might easily resent interference because it is a question of the management of their own domestic affairs. We try to do our best to indicate we would like them to make more sterling available for United Kingdom citizens who leave their country and come to settle in ours, but that is a proposition which they must look at pretty narrowly, and I would look at it pretty narrowly if the case were reversed. We also say we would like them to remove the restrictions which are placed on exchange to buy our goods so that they could buy more Canadian apples and Canadian cheese, but when all is said and done it is their business, not ours.

Mr. FULTON: Can the minister tell us what consideration has been given, in the case of immigrants coming over, to accepting as a basis of credit the

pounds sterling which they have in the United Kingdom, where such funds exist, putting them in a blocked account, and then making dollars available to them to an equivalent amount against the day when pounds sterling and dollars would be freely convertible?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I must say I have not given any personal consideration to that since I became minister, but I am informed by the officials that this plan has been considered.

Mr. FULTON: Were there any insuperable obstacles?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should be glad if Mr. Smith would care to tell the committee whatever did happen.

Mr. SMITH: There have been unofficial discussions on several occasions, the result of which has been a lessening of the restrictions.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that is not Mr. Fulton's point. His point is: have we ever considered lending money to immigrants against balances which they have in the United Kingdom?

Mr. SMITH: It has been discussed, but I do not know the results, as these discussions have taken place between the department and the Department of Finance through the Bank of Canada. There have been obstacles, but I really do not know the details.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be prepared to present a statement on it, but I do not know anything about it at the present time. I do know however that the subject had once been canvassed, but I do not know more than that.

Mr. FULTON: If the committee concurs, perhaps the minister would be kind enough to give that information to the committee and let us know what the difficulties were, because I am sure all of us are interested in finding ways and means.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are interested in finding anybody who will come and invest more capital in this country. But I imagine it is the indirect effect on immigration rather than the direct effect which would have more effect there, because the number of immigrants who would have more than £2,000, they would bring right away — —

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am surprised to find any who had £2,000. When I was in Britain last year I saw experienced linesmen, telegraphic and telephone linesmen, who after years of service could hope to graduate to the stupendous sum of $30 a week. And that was a high wage, much higher than the average wage for skilled workers in Britain. So I cannot see how they could even save enough to pay their passage.

Mr. THATCHER: If we can "pressure" the British government in any way to let them bring out more exchange, I still think we would get more immigrants.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think so too, and if they would make their currency absolutely free, it would be better still. But that is for them to decide.

Mr. DUPUIS: I would like to get some information—I may not be able to get it today through the minister or the deputy minister—as to the number of government representatives of our immigration department as follows:

(*a*) In the United Kingdom or the Commonwealth Nations;

(*b*) In France and in its colonies;

(*c*) In Belgium; and

(*d*) In Italy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I might be permitted to put this table on record right now. Would the committee like to have it? It won't take me more than a few minutes.

Question: The number of immigration posts abroad, the number of employees at each post, the number who are Canadian and the number who are non-Canadians?

1. There are twenty immigration posts abroad.

Post	*Canadian*	*Non-Canadian*	*Total*
London, England	21	40	61
Liverpool, England	10	14	24
Belfast, Northern Ireland	4	5	9
Glasgow, Scotland	6	12	18
Dublin, Ireland	2	4	6
Athens, Greece	4	7	11
Berne, Switzerland	2	4	6
Brussels, Belgium	6	9	15
Copenhagen, Denmark	4	8	12
Hanover, Germany	8	36	44
Hong Kong	6	9	15
Helsinki, Finland	1	4	5
Karlsruhe, Germany	15	54	69
Linz, Austria	5	14	19
New Delhi, India	3	9	12
Oslo, Norway	1	4	5
Paris, France	8	22	30
Rome, Italy	8	19	27
Stockholm, Sweden	1	4	5
The Hague, Holland	8	16	24
	123	294	417

Mr. DUPUIS: Those people are employed on recruiting immigrants?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are all immigration officers, all officers of our department.

Mr. DUPUIS: Could the minister give me a copy of that statement?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It will appear in the record.

Mr. THATCHER: There was a total of 116 on United Kingdom immigration. Could the minister explain why we would have 30 in France and only 27 in Italy when we are bringing five times as many from Italy as we are from France? What would the reasoning be there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I shall have to ask Mr. Smith to give an explanation.

Mr. SMITH: Because in France we have a number of refugees from other countries. The processing in Paris is really one of our most difficult places of work.

Mr. THATCHER: I understand. Would you explain the figure for India. You have 12, yet we are not getting immigrants from India to any extent.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, we are getting 150 a year. It is a good illustration of how difficult it is to operate a quota. There is a quota of 150 and it has to be apportioned. Of course most of those 12 people are locally employed.

Mr. THATCHER: You surely wouldn't need one man in your immigration department to process 150 persons on the average per year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: After all, it is not the number you process; it is the number of applications you have which make your work. Suppose I got

90 letters a day and say "no" to 89 of them, I still have to write 90 letters, even though I only process one.

Mr. THATCHER: How many do you process to get 150?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I haven't got the foggiest idea. There are only three Canadians.

Mr. THATCHER: There are 12 employed.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suspect the other employees are not paid very much. When we opened the office I am told we had 20,000 applications.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Applications for jobs in the office, do you mean?

Mr. THATCHER: When did you open the office? You must have had that as a backlog. You would not have had that many in a standard year because if you would, then I withdraw my question.

Mr. LAVAL FORTIER (Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): There are not that many, month by month, but they are still in the thousands per year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, you know as well as I do that we do not have an office in India for the purpose of getting immigrants for the sake of increasing the population of Canada. We agreed upon this quota as a gesture for the improvement of commonwealth relations. And having done so, we have to treat these applicants decently and have enough employees there to answer the letters and deal with the correspondence and the applications which are received.

I am much more worried about some of the European posts where we have a certain staff and where in fact we would like to get immigrants. I refer particularly to the Scandinavian countries, and the reason there are not many immigrants is that we get very few applications.

Mr. THATCHER: Perhaps it would be wise to increase our quota a little.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a matter of opinion. We have an agreement with the Indian government at the present time.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): What about Finland?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have very grave doubts about Finland. The Finns are very fine people, but we get very few immigrants, and I really ask myself quite seriously whether our office is not costing more than is warranted.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Our immigration from the Scandinavian countries has gone down.

Mr. SMITH: It was down in the last two years from what it was in 1951.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Have you any idea why? Was it because of conditions at home?

Mr. SMITH: Most of it is due to the fact that the economic situation has improved in their own countries. The highest intake is from Denmark and still continues to be. We were busiest in Sweden in 1951, owing to the large number of refugees from the Baltic countries, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians and the like. In 1951 and 1952 in Norway we were not permitted to recruit nor to furnish any propaganda whatsoever. Lately we have been permitted to show pictures with restrictions. The Norwegian intake is coming up slightly, but it has not gone up as high as we would have liked. But in respect to the years before the war it is practically the same as it was then.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Chairman, I did not catch the figures for the staff at Hong Kong?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Canadian 6 and non-Canadian 9.

I would hope that, as a result of the measures that have just been taken, it might be possible before very long to reduce that number because as the members of the committee know we were trying to meet a situation which was created by the repeal of the Chinese Immigration Act and that backlog must pretty well have been dealt with by now; it certainly should have been.

Again, just as Mr. Thatcher said about the numbers in New Delhi, there are more employees than there should be for the number of immigrants. I admit that right off, but the problems there are very difficult indeed.

Mr. DINSDALE: Could I return, Mr. Chairman, to the matter of export of capital if there are no further questions on this other point.

I have some figures to the effect that an immigrant and a family of five could, within a very short time export up to $10,000 more capital from any such funds which they might have in the United Kingdom for example. That is based on the 2,000 pounds for the immigrant himself and 250 pounds for each dependent.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: 1,000 pounds for the immigrant and 250 pounds for each dependent up to a maximum of 2,000.

Mr. DINSDALE: When he arrives here he could apply for extra currency to obtain the tools of trade and housing and so forth?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, I understand that is the situation. For instance a person who wishes to invest in some business or industry here can make arrangements to transfer funds he has in the United Kingdom.

Mr. DINSDALE: Then it seems to me currency restrictions are not the problem. It would rather seem to be that the inability to migrate as a family might be the basis for the reluctance of immigrants from the United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We might ask Mr. Smith if our officers have reported any experience along those lines. I am just as interested as you are, Mr. Dinsdale. I do not know.

Mr. SMITH: Not recently have they reported that there has been any difficulty in getting families because of the lack of funds for transportation. We certainly could look into it. In the past there was, and our officers over there registered it with us at headquarters asking if we could do anything about it. But recently there have not been any reports that there are large numbers who cannot come owing to lack of money for transportation. If we do have cases such as that in the United Kingdom and France as I said the other day we are today providing assisted passage for the head of the family and also for any workers who may be included in the family.

Mr. FULTON: Those are persons 16 years of age and over, or something like that?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: But not for young children?

Mr. SMITH: No. For those in the working class.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course except for people who would be going to farms as farm labourers where there was a farm house available for the family right on the farm or where some kind of housing exists, it does seem to me that this is a pretty theoretical question because if the family is so poor that they cannot afford to pay the passage for the other members of the family it is pretty unlikely that a loan to that family would be a real help, and the sensible thing to do would be for the breadwinner to come out and get a job, find a place for them to live, and live in a room and save up until he could bring his family.

Mr. FULTON: But that involves a separation from the family. I am very surprised at Mr. Smith's statement that the average length of time is only six months. In order to do it that way, the man has to come out here and find a job and at the same time as he is still under obligation to repay the loan he had under the scheme, he would have to buy or rent a house, and then in addition put up the cash to bring his family out. I am very surprised to hear Mr. Smith say the average person coming from the United Kingdom can do all that within six months. I would have thought it would take much longer.

For the sake of argument, let us give some weight to what the minister says, that the desirable thing would be for the immigrant to come out and get settled first. But if our scheme were enlarged so it would cover the passage of the husband, and then after he has found adequate accommodation which the department regards as suitable, it could be extended for the purpose of bringing his family out, so that these loans would actually cover the bringing out and getting of family units in Canada, I find it very difficult to believe you would not find a lot more desirable immigrants from the United Kingdom who would take advantage of the chance to come out here than are now coming.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will give the matter very careful consideration and if I can convince first myself and then my colleagues that it would be worth trying we will try it.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does Mr. Smith think immigration on a family basis would stimulate immigration from the Scandinavian countries of a very young man and wife and two or three children?

Mr. SMITH: I do not think it would.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What has done more to discourage immigration from Western Europe and particularly from the Netherlands are motions like the motion of want of confidence which is before the House downstairs. I have in my files a good many reports from Europe of the dreadful unemployment in Canada.

Mr. FULTON: The answer is, cure the unemployment and you will not get the motions.

Mr. THATCHER: I would move that we pass item 66 if it is not premature.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): We have not finished that.

I have a matter I would like to bring up. I think it will come under item 66. It was a matter touched on in some of our earlier sittings and I have been thinking it over since that time. It is this question of tabulation of the religious affiliations of immigrants. You remember at that time Mr. Smith told us they were not tabulated and when I asked him what was the purpose of making the enquiries he told us it was for the purpose of directing immigrants to employment when they reached Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In certain cases.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): That was the only reason he gave us for using the information. There was no other purpose for it except that one. In thinking it over I found that a little difficult to understand because I do not see how that can be done unless the information has been tabulated and yet we are told that it is not tabulated.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh no. As a matter of fact I wish to say two things. First of all, I think Mr. Smith quite inadvertently forgot there was one other use to which this information is very frequently put. A number of the churches in this country maintain social agencies at the ports, and we try to use this information to help immigrants get in touch with their own groups in Canada with a view to assisting them find their feet in this country a little faster. It has another use as well. As I understand it, these

applications to which reference is made are from individual prospective employers in this country who want domestic servants or farm labourers, for example, and who say that because these people are going to live in their houses and with their families they would prefer to have someone who is a Catholic or an Anglican or a Presbyterian, as they are. It does not seem to me that there is anything very terrible about that.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am not suggesting that there is anything very terrible about it, Mr. Minister. In fact, I think that you could afford to be much more open with your information, because that brings me to another thing which you mentioned at an earlier sitting, that you were aware of the quite widespread misgiving and suspicions all over the country in the minds of people about the effect of our immigration policy on the balance of religious denominations in the country.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am interested in what you told us just now, that you provide the various denominations with the information about the numbers of their own adherents that are coming.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not the number. When they arrive at Halifax, or whatever port it is, we put the individuals coming on that ship in touch with representatives of their churches who may be there. We do not provide a lot of statistics. We do not do anything whatever in the way of adding up these things. It is just that when the immigrant arrives, if there is, say, a Lutheran minister at Halifax, or Montreal, and we see on the card that the immigrant is a Lutheran, we say, "This man is a Lutheran", and the minister can be of quite considerable help to him. That happens quite often. It has some value for that purpose, as I think everyone would agree.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I think most of you know that I have no religious axe to grind. It is of no importance to me what beliefs my fellow Canadians have. What is important to me is that there are now widespread misgivings on the part of the people of various religious faiths in the country. I think that those misgivings should be allayed. Take, for instance, the charges that are often made, that were made, as you are aware, Mr. Minister, in a letter to yourself, a copy of which was furnished to me—it is not from an actual denomination, it is from a religious group in the country—and in which they voiced their suspicions. I think that it is worth while to avoid suspicion if it can be done, by the publication of the information that has been collected.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am one of those people who really believe in the scriptural injunction, "Let there be light". In the main, I am quite in favour of giving the facts, but I have given this matter a great deal of consideration, and so did my predecessor, who, incidentally, had what we believe to be misconceptions about this matter used against him in the last campaign in his own riding. I cannot persuade myself, Mr. Cameron, that, if we published our statistics every month and listed so many immigrants who are Catholics, so many who are Anglicans, so many who are Lutherans, that we would not have piles of mail from people all over the country saying, "The Catholics are getting ahead", one week, and the next week, "You are trying to fill this country with Protestants, to drown out the Catholics", and that sort of thing. I just do not think that that kind of thing would be desirable.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Perhaps in your secluded spot you do not think that that kind of thing is said today, with very loud voices and not by individuals.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am well aware of it. In spite of my reputation, I do not really live in an ivory tower.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not think you do, but do you not think that that sort of criticism would be stopped if you could show the figures, if they are there. If you could show the number, there would be no further argument.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wish I could really believe it was as simple as that, but my fear is that there would be far more criticisms and division.

Mr. THATCHER: I must agree with the minister on this. I am afraid that it would not help national unity at all if we started telling the people what religions were coming in.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have another argument that will appeal to Mr. Cameron, if not to any other member of the committee: that I do not think that it is the business of the state at all to be computing these statistics. As I understand that famous phrase, "not changing the fundamental character of the Canadian population", it did not mean that if the percentage of Catholics that came into this country in a year was one per cent more than the percentage now in the country, that the country was in danger, or if the percentage of Protestants was two per cent more than the level in the country, the country was in danger. I think that is utter rubbish and unworthy of the Canadian people.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I think so too.

Mr. THATCHER: You would not get a good balance anyway.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It seems to me that to compile this information and publish as though they had an official character statistics on the religion of immigrants would create in many minds the impression that in some way or other our immigration policy is based on religious considerations. It is not based, and ought not to be based on religion. We have no state church. The fact that a person is a Catholic or an Anglican or a Lutheran should not make any difference whatever in regard to his admission to Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I agree with you. Then I would suggest that you stop asking the question. Frankly, the reasons that have been given to me do not appeal to my common sense at all. It would be perfectly simple at the time of entry to tell all immigrants, "If any of you are Lutherans, there is a Lutheran minister, and if any of you are Catholics, there is a Catholic priest". Furthermore, if you place a great deal of emphasis—

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): You would not have to go to the port very often. There would not be many of your group.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I would wish that there were more in my group. If the criticism from the Nickel Belt has subsided, I shall carry on. The argument that you should be able to direct people of a certain religious category to their employment not only strikes me as being very important, but it strikes me as being in contravention of fair employment practices acts in the various provinces.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It certainly would not be in contravention of our own federal legislation.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It would be a contravention of the fair employment acts in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not an expert at all on that.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I do not think that that is a valid argument.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am quite prepared to consider stopping the asking for this information. I am not prepared to say that I will do so. When Mr. Thatcher raised this question first on the 2nd March, or whenever it was, I thought that we did not ask the question and I seemed to be quite

happy with that situation. Having taken that view, I cannot see any particular reason for changing it, but as I say, I do not think I ought to make a snap judgment like that right here.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I think that this ought to be considered. You were not alone. I think that the vast majority of the people of Canada were under the impression that there was no official inquiry as to people's religious beliefs. Now they know there is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They certainly do, and I have already begun to get letters about it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): You had better do something about it.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Do I understand that the religion of the applicants has no bearing on their applications?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: None whatever.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Even if the immigrant says, "I am an atheist".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That makes no difference. He could not be excluded from this country on that ground under the law which takes no account of religious affiliation. As a matter of fact, I am not sure how many of us would feel that if someone stated that he was an atheist, provided that there was nothing else against him and he was otherwise in an admissible class, he ought to be excluded. I do not like to interpret the views of other people, but it seems to me that if we are honest about this business of not having the state interfere with people's religious beliefs — because atheism is a form of belief, you know, — it is not the absence of belief, it is a form of belief— —

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do you exclude because of absence of belief, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should not personally be happy to think we would have excluded Mr. Cameron, because there is always hope of redemption, though perhaps all the members of the committee would not agree with that.

Mr. THATCHER: The information you get about religion today is of value to religious and other organizations who want to contact immigrants and make them feel settled and among friends.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That appeals to me far more than the employment angle. I take the opportunity whenever my duties allow me to see something of these recent immigrants and find out how they are "shaking down" in this country and it does seem to me that the churches, speaking generally, are doing a wonderful job in helping these people to become good Canadians, and anything we can do reasonably to help the churches in that task I should like to do. It may be that we do not need to ask every immigrant this question; it may be that some other technique can be found. I am not at all satisfied that we are making the best use of the information we have now from that point of view. But it is a difficult subject, as I am sure all members of the committee will agree.

Mr. JUTRAS: There is also the employment angle. If you do not put the question while you have the man before you you will get to the point where the employer asks whether a man is of his own religion.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Cameron would take the position, I believe, that the employer would have no right to such information. There is another side to this entirely. You have got to think also of the employee. Take a domestic servant for example going to a rural place. Suppose this girl is a Catholic and we send her to a village where the nearest Catholic church is 20 miles away. You are not going to have a satisfied person there. You are going to have a problem. You get some domestic servant, let us suppose, from Scotland, brought up in a good Presbyterian home, and send her to a community where there are perfectly good Canadians but where they do not

normally speak English in their homes. It is not going to be long before dissatisfaction arises. What we want today is to make these people into satisfied Canadians as quickly as we can. We are not all alike, and there is no use pretending that we are, and we feel more at home with people we have some affinity with in a cultural sense.

Mr. BYRNE: Not a political one. I think Mr. Cameron's point was that in making good Canadians that is about the only—

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): If I wanted someone else to do it, I would not call on you to help me.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. minister that if he were to discontinue asking these questions it would be said in various places that the government was preparing to do something in regard to fetching in a predominant number of members of some group or another. People would say: "They are planning something". One thing would be said in one district, and another thing in another district, and I suggest to the hon. minister that before he makes any change in this, he should consider how it might be misrepresented wherever it might lead to a political advantage.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. Members of the committee will recall that the other day I brought down these statistics and people were poking a lot of fun at the references to racial or ethnic origin. I said Austrian was an absurd description of racial origin. However, I hesitated to change any of them for fear someone would charge me with trying to "cook" the statistics. I did insist that Ireland should be called Ireland and not by the strange Celtic name which some people use, because the Irish Republic itself says that the name of the country in English should be "Ireland", but even then I had several people say to me: "There must be something sinister here." But that, I confess, is a conservative argument.

Mr. FULTON: The minister has enunciated a perfectly good conservative argument, namely that you should not make changes for the sake of making changes. If a system is working we are entitled to think it is working reasonably satisfactorily until the contrary is proved; and unless some abuse is shown with regard to this matter I cannot see any good reason for changing it.

Mr. HENRY: As to the fair employment practices incorporated in the legislation of the province of Ontario I believe they have an exception when it comes to asking the religion of a domestic servant, and I think that only bears out what the minister has said of government policy here. I think Mr. Cameron, with all due respect, should know that most Canadians are not ashamed of their religion. They are proud of whatever religion they profess, and if the Immigration department can usefully employ this information to the benefit of immigrants I believe the collection of such information will meet with the approval of most Canadians.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The only thing I am suggesting is that this is the cause of a great deal of suspicion among various groups and I would like to see some way of lessening that suspicion.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: So would I, because I don't think this government or any government there is ever likely to be in this country is going to want to deluge the country exclusively with adherents of any one church. That is absolute nonsense. Any government is going to try to bring people here who will fit best and most easily into the kind of society we have, and, if I may use the word "conservative" with a small "c", to change that society as little as possible except in the direction of larger numbers and a higher standard of living.

Mr. FULTON: The minister is a progressive conservative!

The CHAIRMAN: Is item 68 carried?

Carried.

Mr. MONTEITH: I should like to say a word about the actual figures with regard to the whole Immigration department.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 67 was carried about a week ago. We are on 66.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would just as soon leave this question now. Mr. Fulton has some questions for the moment.

Mr. FULTON: We have had a lot of discussion on questions of general administration. I would like to bring this matter down to one or two particular aspects of it. I am thinking for instance of the minister's statement that giving information as to the reasons for inadmissibility is something which the department cannot do because if they were to do it they would find that the sources of the information they were receiving from overseas would dry up.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You are thinking of security information only?

Mr. FULTON: I understood you to apply it to the whole broad field.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps you would allow me to restate our objections to giving information to anyone but the applicant himself. And when I say applicant, I mean the person who has actually applied himself for admission, the only person who is legally an applicant at all. We get information from these people because they are applying for permission to come to Canada, and we ask them a lot of questions about their private affairs. I think those people are entitled to have the information which they give in reply to those questions treated as confidential by the Canadian government, against anybody except themselves. I do not think we are entitled to give it out to relatives or to anyone else who represents them. I think any information we give should be given them and to them only. That is the view which I take.

I do in fact transgress that rule myself in one case—wherever someone has tuberculosis or some other curable ailment which we think a course of treatment would cure in a reasonable time. In that case we tell anyone who has a legitimate interest in the matter at all. By legitimate interest I do not mean legal, but a reasonable interest. We do it so that steps can be taken to improve the situation.

My view is that the other kinds of information, the fact that we are turning somebody down because ten years before he did time in jail in Brussels for burglary, or because five years before he spent some time in a mental institution, or anyone of the—you can go down the list of prohibited persons—that to give that information—and say that is the reason we reject the person—that to give that information to any person other than the applicant, would seem to me to be a betrayal of confidence. That is my first point.

Why should we not give it to the applicant? My argument is that the applicant is not a Canadian. He has no legal right whatsoever under the Act to come to Canada. Parliament has decided to establish a department of government presided over by a minister responsible to parliament to decide who can immigrate to this country.

If we are going to bring into this country anything like 150,000 to 200,000 immigrants a year, it would be completely impossible to administer the Act if we undertook to tell every applicant why he was turned down, and to have a long involved argument about it.

I do not think there should be a rule just for one group. Whatever rule there is, should apply to all. That is the real basis for my objection. It has nothing to do with information from any other sources or anything else. Of course the security information which we get from other sources we cannot disclose withut drying up those sources.

Mr. FULTON: By narrowing it down, I do not think we are making as much progress as I hoped, except to narrow the area of disagreement. But do I understand the minister to say that when admission is refused because of health, the prospective immigrant is informed?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If it is a curable defect; but if, on the other hand, the person has something which is incurable, we do not say so.

Mr. FULTON: I am going to put forward a case here for the sake of discussion.

I can see no reason why the applicant should not be informed as to the grounds of rejection, if it is a health ground.

I appreciate that these rejections occasion in the department at the present time a very great deal of correspondence and work. I make the suggestion that if any method could be found of changing the administrative procedure, of changing that rule with regard to the refusal of information, which would have the result of enabling cases to be dealt with upon a consistent basis and in a speedy manner, that it should be carefully considered. I believe that rather than increasing the volume of work, it would in the long run considerably reduce it, because it would establish a well understood routine for dealing with these cases.

So let me make this suggestion. Take just the cases where an applicant is applying for admission to Canada, and where there are relatives in Canada who are interested. According to the procedure which was outlined to us by Mr. Smith the other day, it is the relative who actually initiates the application. Why should not a routine procedure be adopted under which the applicant is advised of the reasons for rejection, in cases where health is the reason, and furnished with a simple form which accompanies the letter advising him of his rejection. The letter would state: "You are rejected for such and such reasons. If you wish your sponsor in Canada to be informed, would you please complete the enclosed form and return it."

Now then, it would be up to the applicant as to whether he makes further efforts to comply with the health standards and to determine whether or not his sponsor in Canada should be advised as to the precise reasons.

I suggest the applicant should be given the details and given an option and for this reason: probably every member of parliament has handled cases where an applicant has been turned down and the sponsor or relative in Canada wants to know what the reason is.

What happens then is that the sponsor enters into correspondence either directly or through a solicitor, with the department. And they say: "What are the reasons?"

Then a letter goes back saying in effect: "We regret to say that your relative is unable to comply with the immigration regulations."

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That's right.

Mr. FULTON: So the sponsor writes another letter asking: "In what respect was he unable to conform?"

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: And then another letter will be written back saying that "we regret that the regulations do not permit us to give you this information."

If he is a persistent sort of person, he goes to his member of parliament, and then another series of correspondence or personal interviews will commence, when probably the file has to be sent down from the district office to headquarters here. So you get, as a result of the failure ot give information—you get the very opposite, or rather you get the very effect that the minister

complains would follow if you give it: you do in fact now get this enormous volume of correspondence, and the multiplication of difficulty in dealing with the cases.

I am told that there are sometimes cases where this sort of situation has occurred. The people concerned will put two and two together and will assume that it was health reasons for which the applicant was rejected. So the sponsor in Canada will write overseas and say: "Is there anything in your physical background which would produce some valid difficulty which would make you inadmissible?" The relation overseas will write back and say: "Yes, I had such and such a condition five years ago, but I believed I was cured now." So by a process of guesswork they decide on what seems to be the particular disability; then perhaps the suggestion will be made: "If I could get treatment for this, I think I would then be able to conform to the standards."

I am told that cases have happened where relatives in Canada have sent money overseas to the immigrant, for him to take medical treatment. They do that. Then they renew their application on the basis that this condition has been dealt with and cured and are then told "Oh that is not the condition for which you were rejected in the first place." Then the whole wretched procedure has to start all over again, with endless letters and fresh attempts made to find out what the real reason is.

Therefore I suggest a quite simple procedure whereby the applicant would be informed—supposing it is a health reason—as to the nature of his disability. If he wishes, the department will withhold it from his sponsor in Canada; but if he says "yes", then the form comes in and when the sponsor makes an inquiry the answer is that he can be furnished the information. That would obviate an enormous amount of correspondence. It would be a very simple matter for the sponsor in Canada to contact the doctors or the departmental officials and say: "Is this a sort of disability which can be cured, and if so, would it result in his admission?"

It would be a very simple matter to answer that yes or no, so that the remedy or treatment could be undertaken, without an enormous amount of correspondence. And if it is a case which is not going to be cured—or rather if it is a case in which a cure would not affect the admissibility, then the matter is disposed of, as a result of the first inquiry—once you accept the practice of granting information.

I submit very seriously that a simple procedure like that would get over the difficulties created by what I call an obstinate refusal to admit a simple principle. That is one way you can get over it. I submit it would be possible to work it out very simply, and such a procedure would make it much simpler to dispose of these cases.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is what we thought we were doing in telling anybody who had a curable malady what it was. After all, the assumption on which this whole argument rests is that we are trying to keep people out of this country. That is not the case at all. We are trying to get them in. But we are being blamed for not getting enough immigrants into the country. We are at least as anxious as any of our critics if a person can comply with the immigration regulations, to admit him. But that doesn't mean there may not be a few cases such as Mr. Fulton has described where someone having some incurable or what is generally regarded as an incurable physical defect of health might get into this kind of situation. But I think they must be very rare indeed because when all is said and done if they were in that kind of situation they would have had a medical examination and they would in most cases know it anyway. There is this other objection: if you start whittling away this

reason and that reason and the other reason for rejection you finally get down to identifying by a process of elimination the rest of the cases as security cases, and that is also something we do not want to do.

Mr. FULTON: We are not arguing that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not basing it primarily on that.

Mr. FULTON: I am going to go further and say that I am not arguing that the nature or detail of any security should be stated.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If you do whittle away all the other reasons then the rest of them by process of elimination will be security cases and you are revealing in a backdoor fashion what you do not tell in a straightforward fashion.

Mr. FULTON: That might quite well be although I frankly cannot see any vital reason why if it is security the person should not be told that simple fact, provided it does not go any further into detail.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are arguments on both sides. I admit that right off, and I understand that the United States immigration service do tell people and we do not. I think it is administratively better not to; they prefer it the other way. I have always felt that it is sufficient to tell these people who have no right to come here anyway that they cannot satisfy the regulations and have done with it at this point rather than have a lot of arguments.

Mr. FULTON: But you do not have done with it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do in 99 per cent of the cases, apart from the inordinately large number of Chinese cases where it is not any of these factors but is a question of identity or age. And we have not concealed that; we have always told them that we were not satisfied about the identity or about the age. We have given them every opportunity to have the true age furnished and the identity established. We have certainly given that opportunity over and over again in some cases. But outside of the inordinately large proportion of these cases, in all the other cases, the number is very small indeed of those cases where in fact there is much correspondence about a rejection. It is true sometimes there are very persistent people because the only obstinate people in the world are not those of us in this department; there are very persistent people who keep on writing and writing and writing, and we try to deal with them politely and sympathetically as we always try to do in this department. But I think if we started giving reasons we would multiply the number of such cases out of all proportion to the number of letters we now receive about individual cases.

Mr. FULTON: But you admit that in curable cases you do give reasons?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, because I think we should.

Mr. FULTON: Are these not matters which could be quite readily and quickly dealt with? If in cases rejected on reasons of health, whether they be curable or incurable, you give the reason to the applicant, and if he furnishes a form and signes it you then give the reason to his sponsor, then if it is a genuinely incurable case he would not write letters or write to members of parliament because he knows it is an incurable case. But suppose there is a margin, whether it is curable or incurable, the applicant or sponsor is going around in the dark because they do not know what the disease is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I might try to have a look taken. We would have a pretty fair idea about how many rejections there are for this reason over the last few months, medical incurables, and could see what the volume of them is. The facts are always a great solvent in these matters. I do not reject the suggestion out of hand at all.

Mr. BYRNE: I do see some sense in Mr. Fulton's argument, but I am wondering if the applicant himself is not aware of the prohibited groups in our legislation, that is the factors which would prohibit his coming into Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We try to tell them but you know what a human being is; you know how you and I are when we are confronted with our income tax forms.

Mr. BYRNE: Is it not possible for him to obtain a copy of the Act in his language where he can see that there are a number of things which prohibit the immigrant? Can he not get that from the officer when he applies, and if he has some disease it should be easy for him to see that this is the reason.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In places where the English or French languages are spoken a copy of the Act would be there, but I believe it is true that we do not have copies of the Act in the other languages. And you have tried to read the Act as I have; I do not know what the average immigrant would make of it. We do try very hard to tell them what the disabilities are.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): On the point raised by Mr. Fulton, is it not a fact that these applications are turned down by your examining board of medical men?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): If the sponsor was advised here in Canada that a certain immigrant was turned down by our local boards immediately he would go and consult his own medical doctor who would not agree with that board. That would be the first thing, because I have had some of those cases where the doctor said that is not serious, they should not object to a fellow like that coming in, and immediately the sponsor thinks he has a point and he goes to see you.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Or you.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Yes, me. He tells the minister that that is not serious. Who is going to judge these things? How many doctors agree on a diagnosis unless a person is dead?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No doubt Mr. Gauthier has put his finger on a problem. I am always getting letters from members of parliament saying they have consulted such and such a doctor who has seen such and such an X-ray and that our people do not know what they are talking about. Would I have another examination and so on. I am willing to have as many examinations as the applicants are willing to pay for.

Mr. FULTON: Do you not admit that as a result of that sort of review there have been cases when the decision has been changed, not as a result of pressure but as a result of a proper and careful review?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Absolutely. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. FULTON: That, I think, is the complete answer to Mr. Gauthier.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. As a matter of fact—

Mr. FULTON: If there had not been a dissenting opinion, the change would not have been made. And an applicant who was in fact admissible would have been denied admission.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps the chairman knows this better than other people. You have the same sort of thing in relation to Canadian citizens who do have rights. I am sure that these cases come up in the Veterans Affairs committee, differences between doctors of the Board of Pension Commissioners and the individual's own doctor. I am sure that the same things happened when you joined the army, Mr. Fulton.

Mr. FULTON: Indeed they did not—I didn't quarrel with the doctors!

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not in your case. You are so obviously healthy.

Mr. FULTON: That is another answer that you have just given, that the right of disagreement, if you like to call it that, is perfectly recognized in those cases. It would be a horrible situation if the opinion of the Canadian

Pension Commission was taken in every case, with no right to bring in outside medical opinon to bear on the application.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, we have to consider the practical problem of how much you can do with 400 employees scattered all around the world, dealing with enough applications to get 150,000 immigrants a year. I do not pretend it is perfect. It is a rough and ready process, and they are going to make mistakes, and they do make mistakes, and sometimes, unfortunately, we have to deport people. I do not like to deport people; I hate it; and I do not like to bring people in who are apt to be deported, if it can be avoided.

Mr. FULTON: I repeat again in all seriousness my suggestion that, if the possibility will only be admitted, an administrative procedure could be worked out which instead of increasing your administrative difficulty would in fact reduce it, by reducing it to a standard simplified procedure.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: We will look at the number of cases that there are.

Mr. HENRY: Do I understand that epilepsy is an absolute bar to admission?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Page 9 of the Immigration Act deals with prohibited classes. I read a summary of this at a speech I made to the young men's board of trade or chamber of commence in Winnipeg. I think that they were horrified before I was finished with the prohibited classes. Section 5 (*a*) (iv), under "prohibited persons", states:

> Persons who, if immigrants, are afflicted with epilepsy.

Apparently you can be a visitor with epilepsy, but not an immigrant.

Mr. HENRY: Are there no circumstances where you consider it curable?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It has nothing to do with me, Mr. Henry. You put it in the law when you were a member of parliament and I was not.

Mr. HENRY: I am not complaining about its being there, but there is a very difficult position in one particular case, where they seem to think that you have some power.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have no power as to anyone who is an immigrant. That refers to any person known to be an epileptic. That was put in by parliament.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does that exclude a person with a non-active lung spot?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, under the present law there is a point at which people who have had tuberculosis are considered cured or nearly cured.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Is there not a waiting period?

Mr. SMITH: Two years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is quite strict, really. There are some very pathetic cases, for instance, where one member of a family comes under this category and it is necessary to turn down the whole family on that account. It is very difficult when there is epilepsy or something incurable.

Mr. FULTON: I have another question on administrative procedure. Is it your practice to refuse to make copies of applications submitted by the applicants available to the applicant himself or his solicitor?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: His copy of the application is available to the applicant. He makes the application.

Mr. FULTON: In cases where he is asking for a review?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: By an applicant? You mean a genuine applicant?

Mr. FULTON: I understand that the general situation is that the officials at the various ports say, "These files are confidential", and there have been cases, I am told—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The application form itself?

Mr. FULTON: —where, because it is part of the department's file—

Mr. SMITH: We do not make copies of the application. The applicant himself makes a copy, and we presume that he keeps a copy. If he wishes to show them to some person, he should produce his own copy. The information has sometimes leaked out, and in those cases we have not been able to prove whether it has come from our offices or where it came from. The information on these applications is rather personal, to the extent that some individuals learned by some way or other how much money an applicant had, and there were cheques issued against his account which had been proved to be forged. We have always treated any information in our files as confidential, unless we got a written statement from the applicant that he has no objection to its being disclosed.

Mr. FULTON: I wonder if that is generally understood by some of your officers. I am informed that in some cases where an application has been rejected this sort of thing will occur: the applicant goes to consult a solicitor, who says, "What did you say in your application form?" The man says, "I do not have a copy of it; I did not keep a copy of it." The solicitor writes to the department and says, "I have been consulted by Mr. X, the applicant, and he advises that his application is not approved for various reasons. I am without a copy of the application. I want to present a case for review. Would you please supply me with a copy of the application form?"

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are you speaking about true applicants or sponsors? The sponsor has absolutely no right to it.

Mr. FULTON: I am thinking of an application say by an East Indian for his relatives.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are sponsors. There is no provision for that in either the Act or the regulations. Where it is a case of sponsorship, it is purely an administrative procedure within the department.

Mr. FULTON: This is a case where he is not asking for a copy filed by a third person, but a copy of the document filed by the client of this solicitor. As you know, particularly in Chinese cases, they have to give information as to their trips out of Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean these sponsors' documents. I would imagine that, if a solicitor wrote and said that the sponsor had lost a copy of the document—

Mr. FULTON: Or never kept a copy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Or never kept a copy, and he had an authenticated letter from the sponsor asking that we give the information to the solicitor, we would give it without hesitation.

Mr. FULTON: I have been advised of copies being refused.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If any document signed by the client is received saying that the client did not keep his copy of his form and would like a copy—the director tells me that we have done it in the past, but if we have not done it in the past we will from now on. Where the solicitor provides a letter from the sponsor saying: "I would like "X" solicitor to be given a copy of the document I submitted to the department" then we would not have the slightest hesitation. The letter must be signed by the applicant if it is meant to authorize us to give out to the solicitor a letter which the applicant has written.

Mr. FULTON: May I suggest that a general letter of instruction should be given to all your officers throughout Canada, because I gather some of them do what the minister has described, and others refuse.

Mr. SMITH: It has been sent out to certain solicitors—the conditions on which we would disclose documents. We have noticed that in many instances there is more than one solicitor engaged in an application. Therefore we cannot take these requests from solicitors unless they are supported by a letter from the applicant saying he would appreciate our giving a copy of whatever he requires to the solicitor in question. We have already advised a solicitor, who made a point of this quite some time ago, of the procedures we would follow because of his insistence that he had the right to go into our office, and see the information at his client's request.

Mr. JUTRAS: You said that sponsors would be given this information?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We would not give the sponsor anything which had been provided by the applicant. But take Mr. Fulton's case. He said it was the case of an East Indian. Presumably the East Indian had a relative in Canada who was a sponsor, and that sponsor made an application to have his relative in India admitted. We would not give an application filled out by the applicant in India to a solicitor unless the applicant in India had written and asked us to. But we would give a document to the sponsor when it had been written by the sponsor himself, should he ask for it. In other words it is the person who signed the document who is the only one we would consider as being in a position to authorize us to release it to a third party. I would take a most serious view of any employee in the Immigration department who without proper authority disclosed the private affairs of any applicant to a person who should not have this information. We are dealing here with the private affairs of individuals, and they are supposed to be treated as private.

Mr. FULTON: Where the applications are placed in the hands of a solicitor and you are satisfied that the solicitor is acting in good faith for both the sponsor and the potential immigrant, why is it that you do not permit the solicitor access to the file?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What do you mean by "access to the file?"

Mr. FULTON: The right to go into the office and look over the file.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What would he look at in the file?

Mr. FULTON: At the application forms filed by both the sponsor and the prospective immigrant. He should have the right to see any letter written by the sponsor and the prospective immigrant, and the department's replies thereto.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The simple reason we do not do it is that they do not happen to be my employees, and they have not taken the oath of secrecy which my employees take. I am the trustee for the files; they belong to the department, and I would consider it highly improper if people from outside were given the right to come in and examine them in such circumstances.

Mr. HENRY: I take it there would be documents in connection with these files which would not be available even in parliament?

Mr. FULTON: Let us leave that last question aside for a moment. He would want to see correspondence between the department and the immigrant and the sponsor. Not confidential reports. Let us narrow this down, if there is an objection to producing confidential reports such as correspondence between the district office and the overseas office.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do say this: that if a sponsor claims that he has written a letter to us and lost it, or that he has not kept a copy, or that he has received a letter from us and then lost the letter, then if he will write a letter to us to specify these things and ask that they be given to his solicitor, we would be perfectly reasonable about it. But there could be nothing else on the file to which a client of a solicitor would be entitled, and a

solicitor is not entitled to anything which his client would not be entitled to, except politeness to the same degree. In the case of documents emanating from a sponsor, we would make copies of them, though quite a lot of work would be required, if a sponsor authorized us to give them to the solicitor. Equally, if an applicant himself asked that any information he had given should be so disclosed, and signed a letter to that effect, we should take the same view.

Mr. FULTON: I think the minister is placing one obstacle in the way which he could remove, but I will not deal with that at the moment. If the principle be admitted of the right of the interested parties or their solicitor, properly authorized, to obtain this information, it would be perfectly proper for the department to establish a tariff of charges for making copies of any documents so required. But I think a scheme should be considered whereby, to avoid the work of making the copies, accredited and responsible solicitors should be able to see the documents in their original form. But I am not pressing this at the moment, because I understand the hon. minister to state that provided there is proper authorization the department would not object to making copies of the documents furnished by the interested parties, and the correspondence between those parties and the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Nothing which came from an applicant in India would be made available unless the applicant in India had signed the authority. And nothing from the sponsor would be made available unless the sponsor had signed the authority in a similar way.

Mr. FULTON: I am afraid the hon. minister did not quite follow me. I said, at the outset; "Where it is established that the solicitor is acting both for the sponsor and the prospective immigrant."

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would not satisfy me if he merely had a letter which had been signed by the applicant appointing him solicitor. The applicant has got to show what specifically he wants me to give to the solicitor, and if it is something which emanated from him, we would make it available.

Mr. HENRY: A number of these application forms would, I take it, contain memoranda which would normally be privileged, and if I am correct about that I think it would make the application form non-producible unless the part which was not privileged were copied.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not prepared even to consider making our files available to anybody. The files are the property of the government of Canada for which I am a trustee.

The CHAIRMAN: One could imagine this situation. We shall suppose a sponsor wants to get his son out here, and the son in making out his application has to admit that he has been guilty of some crime involving moral turpitude, and he is turned down for that reason.

Then the sponsor wants to know why. And it seems to me going very far to suggest that it should be disclosed by the department that the young fellow has been guilty of an offence when probably that would be the last thing in the world he would want his father or mother to know.

The suggestion is that if the sponsor hires a lawyer and the applicant agrees to have this lawyer act for him too then the lawyer would have the right to come in and see what this young fellow had put in his application.

That might be the first time that the parents would know that this young lad had got into trouble, Surely the fair position is that when this man makes out this form, unless he himself authorizes the contents to be released, then nobody should have the right to look at it. Surely any solicitor would take that attitude towards any confidential documents placed in his possession. If not, I think he would be disbarred very promptly.

Surely the same high respect for confidence in the disclosure of confidential information should be exercised by a department such as the Department of Immigration.

Mr. FULTON: I do not know the purpose of the chairman suddenly entering into the argument. I can dispose of his point, because that suggestion has not been made.

The CHAIRMAN: The purpose is this: Although I am chairman, I am also a member of this committee; and it seems to me that you are laboring this point and laboring it and laboring it. You have been told the reason for this rule.

Mr. FULTON: For the first time, Mr. Chairman, we were approaching an area of agreement and you are now making it more difficult.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think you were approaching an area of agreement and I do not think I have made it more difficult.

Mr. FULTON: Then evidently you were not following the discussion or else you are deliberately misinterpreting it. I was dealing with a case where it is established that the solicitor is acting under the authority both of the sponsor in Canada and of the prospective immigrant overseas.

The CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what I said. I have certain rights in this committee. In spite of what may be your idea, I still have certain rights in this committee too.

Mr. FULTON: But I would beg you not to misinterpret what was said. The Minister understands what was said.

The CHAIRMAN: May I point out to you that a solicitor—even though he is acting for both people—would have no right to go in and see certain confidential documents of the other party, one of them being the application of the applicant and the other the form signed by the sponsor. The mere fact that a sponsor may retain a solicitor in this country, and the applicant overseas may agree to that solicitor acting for him—

Mr. FULTON: That is not what I said at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Well that is what I think the committee understood you to say. I understood you to say that if there was a common solicitor—

Mr. FULTON: I said, where the solicitor was in fact acting for the sponsor and for the immigrant overseas.

The CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

Mr. FULTON: It is not merely a case of the immigrant acquiescing; he is duly authorized; he is, as it were, the solicitor of record for both parties.

The CHAIRMAN: Your suggestion is that because somebody overseas agrees that a solicitor shall act for him in a given case, and the sponsor has retained that solicitor and has agreed that he should act, surely that should not give the solicitor the right to see confidential documents which one of them signed.

Mr. FULTON: If you agree that the solicitor act?

The CHAIRMAN: If I agree that he sees my confidential documents, that is a different matter; but I only agreed that he should act for me, and that does not give him that right.

Mr. FULTON: For heaven's sake! Where you are retained to act in a case, and in order to act in the case it necessitates your reviewing documents prepared for the case—you said that you retained the solicitor on the basis that he act for you in the case—surely he has to see the documents prepared for the case. Surely he has the right to see them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have neither the advantage nor the disadvantage of being a solicitor. I am a simple layman with a relatively simple mind. I have in my possession certain confidential files about the private lives of certain individuals. The only basis on which I will make public to anybody

whatever—perhaps I should not say "make public", but give to any third person any information provided by either the sponsor or the applicant is when the written instruction from that sponsor or that applicant is given to me to make available an identifiable thing which that person has himself provided.

Mr. FULTON: If the chairman had not interfered, I think the minister and I would have been getting along well.

The CHAIRMAN: The chairman will intervene whenever he feels that the committee's time is being wasted. Over and over again the minister stated, on three different occasions, the terms under which he will make these documents available.

You persisted in repeating your question over and over again. After all, the other members of the committee are busy men and they have other work to do. It is not fair for you to state something over and over again.

Mr. FULTON: I wish you would follow your own precepts. I understand the minister is then prepared to make it clear to the offices across the country?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it is already clear to them, but if there is any doubt about it, I will be glad to repeat it.

The CHAIRMAN: He stated it three times.

Mr. FULTON: Well this is the first time I have heard it.

The CHAIRMAN: Then your hearing must be bad.

Mr. FULTON: May I ask you not to be rude.

The CHAIRMAN: You stated it was the first time you had heard it, and if that is the case then your hearing must be bad.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn I would like to say that I think the work of this committee has been very valuable, but we still have covered only eight items, and we have still two main divisions of this department to come before us. So I wonder. I do not know if there is a steering committee to this committee, but I wonder if the parties might not get together and allocate their time in some way. Otherwise we are not going to get through this department. It seems to me that we should lengthen our work and start sitting longer hours.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should consider sitting twice a day.

Mr. THATCHER: That would be pretty stiff. Could you not first call the representatives of the parties together and see if there is any way we could allocate this work? If we spend another month on this department, then we are not going to get to the other departments at all.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought we were just about to end with the immigration branch.

Mr. THATCHER: Then what about Indian Affairs?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought it would be completely non-controversial. There were one or two pieces of information that I undertook to provide, and on the understanding that I provide them can we consider we are finished with the immigration branch?

Mr. MONTEITH: No, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have a few minutes tomorrow morning on the overall financial aspects of the branch.

The CHAIRMAN: Why not go ahead with it now.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Do you think that another ten minutes would be enough? It would really be an immense convenience. When all is said and done we have a lot of work to do and I keep bringing these officers here.

Mr. MONTEITH: As long as I am not cut off in the middle.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wouldn't think of cutting anyone off, Mr. Monteith.

I would like to remind any members of the little party which Mr. Howe and I are having at 8 o'clock at the design centre for the presentation of the industrial design awards. It is on Elgin Street in the Laurentian Building.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Monteith, do you think that it will take about ten minutes?

Mr. MONTEITH: It may take a little longer. I might be disputed in some of my surmises here. I think perhaps we should leave it until tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the members are prepared to sit now for ten minutes or somewhat more in order to have it completed.

Mr. MONTIETH: Mr. Chairman, I have given the estimates and actual expenditures according to the public accounts of the Immigration branch some study and I have come to the conclusion—true it was said in earlier evidence that the estimates of the department are approached originally by reviewing the estimates of the previous year—that the department officers do not give any, or at least sufficient attention, to actual expenditures in previous years. For instance, in the consideration of administration under the Immigration branch in the years 1952-53 there was an actual surplus of $77 thousand odd.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That of course is not Immigration. It is the administration branch. It is the administration of the whole department.

Mr. MONTEITH: Immigration branch administration. In the field inspectional service Canada there was a surplus of $350 thousand odd. In the Immigration field and inspectional service abroad there was a surplus of more than $336,000. In the transportation assistance for immigrants there was a surplus of about $2,288,000. That comes to a total surplus in the order of $3,052,000.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There must be some mistake about this last item. There was only $500,000 and I do not think there could be—

Mr. MONTEITH: I said 1952-53.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am sorry.

Mr. MONTEITH: An estimate of $2,600,000 and there was spent $311,000 odd, and that comes to a surplus of $2,288,000. In the total Immigration branch there was a surplus of $3,052,000 on estimates of $10,116,000. In the year 1953-54—this is still comparing estimates with actual expenditures according to public accounts—in the administration branch of the Immigration department there was a surplus of $67,000 roughly. In the field inspectional services Canada, a surplus of $476,000 odd. In the Immigration field and inspectional services abroad there was a surplus of $174,000 odd. Then, in the transportation assistance for immigration there is a surplus $1,401,000, coming to a total surplus for the Immigration branch of about $2,120,000.

Now, in 1952-53 that is a surplus of over 30 per cent of the estimates, and in 1953-54 it is a surplus of over 22 per cent of the estimates, and that includes supplementary estimates and everything else.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It does not matter to me, but the word "surplus" suggests we are a wonderful money making institution. What you mean is that we did not spend the money which we might have spent.

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes. What I am getting around to is to show that your estimates have been regularly much too high and that you do not spend the money and do not need it this year and I am convinced that you do not according to these figures.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If we do not need it we will not spend it, I can assure you.

Mr. MONTEITH: Why should parliament be asked to vote it just to afford a nice cushion in the department? I am not saying that you should not have some little cushion, but I am suggesting that the cushion has been much too extensive. The following is, according to the 1955 estimates. The figures used as estimated expenditures are taken from the 1955-56 estimates. So there is a surplus of $52,000 intimated.

The CHAIRMAN: What are you referring to?

Mr. MONTEITH: The estimates for 1954-55 and the estimated expenditures as listed in the 1956 estimates for the year 1954-55.

The CHAIRMAN: What particular item?

Mr. MONTEITH: I am again back at administration of the Immigration branch.

There is an estimated surplus of $52,000. In the field and inspectional services in Canada there is an estimated surplus on the same basis of $324,000. In the field services abroad there is an estimated surplus of $71,000 and in the transportation assistance for immigrants the surplus estimated is $210,000. That is a total of $657,000. That is about 7·3 per cent.

Mr. HENRY: The cushion is getting thinner each year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is why we cut $120,000 off this year.

Mr. MONTEITH: Your total estimates for this year are roughly $8,874,000. I cannot see from the previous record of the department how that can help being very considerably above what you are actually going to require. As a consequence, those estimates should be reduced for the immigration branch as a whole by 5 per cent, and I am quite convinced that that will still allow the department some cushion. I do not think the parliament of Canada should be called upon to provide that kind of money.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The 5 per cent would be—

Mr. MONTEITH: $443,710.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, I admit at once, Mr. Monteith, that there is one cushion, as you call it, and we admitted that the other day. That is this amount for transportation, $100,000, which we do not expect to spend at all. We do not expect to spend one nickel of that, but it was included, as was pointed out to members of the committee, just in case we might find it necessary during the year, because of an abnormal movement or shortage of shipping, to charter shipping or aircraft. I do not think it would be a disaster if that were cut out of the estimates, but it is our intention to use it only for that purpose, if we use it at all. To that extent I plead guilty right off.

Mr. MONTEITH: What item is that? Is that in item 68?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Item 69.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the $500,000 item?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. In that $500,000 item, we hope we will spend as little as possible of the proportion of that required for the relief and assistance of immigrants. We cannot guess what that will be.

Mr. MONTEITH: Your previous years of experience should indicate that you will not spend anything like that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I hope you are right, but that is not what some of your friends on your side of the House were saying in the debate down below.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am simply—

Mr. FULTON: What is the basis for that extraordinary statement?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I mean that if unemployment is getting steadily worse, that expenditure will go up. That is what it is for.

Mr. FULTON: Would you spend more on immigration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: On relief. This is the relief item about which we are talking. That seems to be self-evident. I hope that we will not have to spend a nickel on it, but I am afraid that we will have to spend a little.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that there has been too much padding—and I do not think that that is an incorrect word to use—through the department, at least in the last three years up to this year, and I do not think there would be any reason for ceasing that practice at this stage—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We took off $120,000, and that was after we had provided for a somewhat larger staff and also for very considerably larger salaries. Since the estimates were prepared a year ago, there was a salary increase, and there was the institution of the five-day week in Canada. We have a very large number of employees at the border, where the five-day week means more employees, and there is no getting around it.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is it admitted that in past years there has been a good deal of padding and that this year there has not.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I could not answer that question, because this is the first year that I have had the honour to be the minister.

Mr. MONTEITH: I think that you admitted that your employees prepared the estimates. Probably you go over them afterwards—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I certainly go over them.

Mr. MONTEITH: I do not think that the spending authorizes this kind of vote.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would say this, that my predecessor who is now the Minister of Finance is probably Minister of Finance in part because even though parliament had voted money which he could have spent, he was most economical in the spending of it, and it seems to me the record which you have given shows conclusively that he has been most careful and prudent in the use of public money.

Mr. MONTEITH: I think it shows conclusively he has over the years estimated much larger sums than necessary, and that as a consequence people of Canada have paid much larger sums in taxes than they need have paid.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that is a much larger question, and probably it might be debated in the budget debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us run over the estimates which Mr. Monteith has referred to. If you look at the estimates for 1955-1956 on page 146 you will find that the estimates over the year for administration amount to $892,000. If you take the amount spent last year based on the estimate for the balance of the year until March 31 you will find that the actual expenditure for 1954-55 on administration will be $968,000 and the department is asking for $892,000 this year. It is asking for $24,000 less than it spent last year.

Mr. FULTON: There has been a considerable reduction in staff. There was a reduction of 13.

The CHAIRMAN: $24,000 less in the actual administration. Then we come to page 148. The actual amount asked for this year is $5,648,000. The actual amount spent last year on the same basis will have been, by the end of 1954-55, $5,367,000 so there is something over $200,000 more being asked this year than last year.

Mr. MONTEITH: Before you leave that item. You actually asked for $324,000 more than you spent last year. You asked a year ago for $5,691,000, and you are spending $5,367,000.

The CHAIRMAN: You are mistaken on that because the 1954-55 estimates last year were $5,691,000.

Mr. MONTEITH: And you are estimating to spend $5,367,000. It leaves a surplus of $324,000.

These estimated figures throughout the years, such as this $5,367,000 have invariably proved to be larger than the total amount spent when the Public Accounts come out.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us get an explanation from the Deputy Minister. After all we are here to get the facts. If there is any question about it, it seems to me the deputy minister should be able to explain why it was the department in 1954-55 asked for approximately $300,000 more than they managed to spend in the year.

Mr. MONTEITH: That is a good term—"managed to spend".

The CHAIRMAN: I said that because when they "managed to spend" they "managed not to spend" $300,000 which they got from parliament. How did you manage to spend $300,000 less than was voted, Mr. Deputy Minister? Have you got that?

Mr. FULTON: It might better be put: How do you manage to ask for $300 thousand more than you spent?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I think it is to their credit that they spent $300 thousand less than parliament thought they were entitled to spend. I think that is a fair question.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think the deputy minister would have to answer that because I certainly do not know the answer.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact I think that with these questions we are getting right down to what the estimates committee should be doing. I would have to hurry this.

Mr. MONTEITH: That is why I would prefer to leave it until tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not know you were going to get right down to business as you have. I welcome such a thing and I think we should take the time to deal with it.

Mr. FORTIER: In that vote for field and inspection service in Canada there is money provided for the deportation of people. Last year we provided $100 thousand, but this year we provided $50 thousand instead of $100 thousand.

As you study this vote you must remember that up to 1953, the first of June, 1953, the cost of deportation and the cost of detention in Canada was the responsibility of the transportation companies. But in 1953 through the new Act—Sections 40 and 41 I believe—the Canadian government is now responsible for these costs of deportation and detention, for which we have had to estimate in the 1953-1954 estimates which you quoted, and which we, fortunately enough, did not have to spend, but the experience so far is only that of a year and a half.

There are still people who arrived before the new Act came into effect, and for whom we could still charge the company who brought them to Canada.

The estimation of how much it will cost for detention and how much it will cost for deportation will vary from year to year. In order to arrive at an accurate figure, one must trust to a certain extent its reading through the crystal ball.

Mr. MONTEITH: That may be, but I do not see any ryhme or reason at all for such an over estimate over the years. I am assuming that these estimates in this year were built up on the same premises and suppositions as in previous years. Yet the result of previous years proves the estimates to be much too great. If we reduce them by 5 per cent, I am still convinced it would leave ample reserves for all these indefinite factors.

As a consequence I am going to move, seconded by Mr. Fulton, that the estimates of the Immigration branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration amounting to $8,874,205 be reduced by 5 per cent, or the amount of $443,710.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am going to have to ask you to let Mr. Monteith's motion stand until the morning, Mr. Chairman. I have just received a notice that I have to be in another place, namely, the cabinet, at 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we not vote on this, because it has been discussed over past meetings.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If the committee is ready to vote on it without a discussion, then I would agree.

The CHAIRMAN: We have been discussing this whole thing over the past several meetings.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If they are ready for a vote now, I will be quite happy.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Mr. Monteith. Is there a desire to discuss it, or are you ready to take a vote on this question?

The motion made by Mr. Monteith is that these estimates be reduced by 5 per cent.

All those in favour of the motion will say "yea". All those against the motion will say "nay".

In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Chairman, I think we had better have it polled.

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk will call the names. There is a motion made by Mr. Monteith that these estimates be reduced by 5 per cent. Those in favour of Mr. Monteith's motion will say "yea"; and those against Mr. Monteith's motion will say "nay". As your name is called, please vote.

(At this point a polled vote was held.)

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost, gentlemen. Can we carry item 66 now?

Mr. FULTON: I do not wish to have any of the officials here tomorrow but I gave a notice of motion which has a bearing on this item. If there were any chance of it being carried I would like to have this open.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will give an undertaking that if any such motion is carried we would keep the departmental administration open so that any such motion could be discussed.

Mr. FULTON: I would like an undertaking that if it were carried and the committee decided to do so, we could call witnesses on item 66.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Subject to that shall the item carry?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will bring Mr. Duggan of the Citizenship branch tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow, if Mr. Fulton brings in his motion we will consider it first and then go to items 60 and 61.

We will meet tomorrow at 10.30 and Wednesday at 3.30.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 12

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. E. Duggan, Registrar, Citizenship Registration Branch; Mr. E. Bussiere, Director, Citizenship Branch, and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, March 15, 1955.
(13)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Naniamo*), Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Fulton, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, Michener, Monteith, Pickersgill, Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. E. Duggan, Registrar, Citizenship Registration Branch; Mr. E. Bussiere, Director, Citizenship Branch; and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Chief of Personnel.

Mr. Fulton moved, seconded by Mr. Dinsdale,—

(1) That the resolution of the Committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955, that the Committee not seek power to send for persons, papers and records, be rescinded.

(2) That the Committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records.

The motion was resolved in the negative on the following recorded division:

Yeas: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Dinsdale, Fulton, Michener, Monteith, Starr, Thatcher, Yuill—8.

Nays: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cannon, Decore, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, Macnaughton, Pickersgill, Stuart (*Charlotte*)—14

The Committee considered the 1955-56 Estimates of the Citizenship Registration Branch, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Item numbered 60 was adopted.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Wednesday, March 16.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee

55165—1½

EVIDENCE

TUESDAY, March 15, 1955.
10.30 A.M.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum, gentlemen, so we will proceed. I understand Mr. Fulton wishes to make his motion now.

Mr. FULTON: I might as well make it now.

The CHAIRMAN: That was your wish.

Mr. FULTON: I said I was prepared to go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not asking you to. I understood yesterday that was what you wished to do.

Mr. FULTON: What I pointed out yesterday was that we were carrying the last item in the Immigration branch and I wanted to reserve the right to call witnesses on that branch if the committee should decide on this motion that it should have that power. I am prepared to go on with it now or whenever you and the committee consider the appropriate and most convenient time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Let us get it over with.

The CHAIRMAN: We were going to go on to Citizenship so I suppose this is the last question which is before the committee on the question of Immigration so far as I know. It is passed subject to this. I suppose we may as well deal with it.

Mr. FULTON: All right, Mr. Chairman.

The motion of which I gave notice of on Friday would, of course, have an effect on the committee's entire proceedings, not only on its work with respect to this department, that is Citizenship and Immigration, but also the work of the committee in studying the estimates of other departments; because the effect of the motion would be to give the committee power to send for persons, papers and records so that we might then call witnesses and obtain documents having a bearing on any phase of the committee's work.

The necessity for the motion I think it apparent. It arises out of two rulings which you yourself have made Mr. Chairman, to the effect that we cannot entertain motions for the calling of witnesses or the production of documents because we have no power to do that. Your ruling is based on the decision of the committee arrived at on February 17, 1955. Therefore, in accordance with the precedents which I cited on Friday, I move, seconded by Mr. Dinsdale: That the resolution of the committee come to on Thursday February 17, 1955, that the committee not seek power to send for persons, papers or records, be rescinded.

2. That the committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records.

I cited last time the authorities on which I base that motion. They will be on the record. The authorities are May, 15th Edition, page 596; two precedents in the Canadian House of Commons committees of 1873; and a more recent one in the veterans affairs committee of 1946. That is the one I would like to deal with briefly this morning because I outlined the others last Friday.

In the veterans affairs committee of 1946 the committee had before it a proposed draft of a new pensions Act and Mr. Pearkes moved—and this is found at page 471 of the proceedings of the committee of veterans affairs—that

there should be a new section which would be called section 62 A having to do with the raising of a presumption based on a veteran's condition as recorded at the time of enlistment. That was moved on May 31 and it was adopted by the committee on that day. Then on June 7, one week later—and I should emphasize that the effect of that first decision was to—

Mr. HENRY: On a point of order, it occurs to me there may be no one on this committee who disputes Mr. Fulton's right to make this motion and it is probably in order. I was wondering if you have anything to say about that, Mr. Chairman. It is on the merits of the motion that we may have a difference of opinion, but as to it being in order I think some words from you might be appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: I have looked into it and I am not sure about the matter. To indicate to you why I am not sure I will read to you from Bourinot. It seems to me the matter is dealt with more fully than any other place in Bourinot 4th Edition on parliamentary procedure, at page 479. I will read to the committee shortly from Bourinot at that page:

> A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration

that is by the House of Commons:

> Or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect. In this way a committee may regularly reconsider and even reverse a decision it has previously arrived at. As the rules of the House govern the procedure of committees generally, a committee cannot strictly speaking renew a question on which its judgment has been already expressed.

Now, it says there: "cannot strictly speaking". What that means I do not know. Does it mean that it cannot do it strictly speaking but can do it not strictly speaking. I do not know what it means.

Mr. HENRY: It all depends whether you want to speak strictly, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN: "We recognize the operation of this rule in the fact that in committee on a bill a new clause or amendment will not be allowed, in contravention of a previous decision. By the general consent of the committee, a clause which has been considered and even adopted may be returned to and reconsidered before the committee has ordered a report, particularly if it is found necessary to make it correspond to some later clause which has been adopted."

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I may interject as a member of the committee I suggest you interpret this leniently in this case and that we vote on Mr. Fulton's motion with the unanimous consent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I just wish to make plain my position in the matter because it may come up again. Here you will see it refers to: "by general consent of the committee a clause may be reconsidered." What does it mean by "general consent"? Does it mean unanimous consent? I do not know. It seems to be a matter which was decided from time to time on the basis of what seemed to be common sense.

I noticed that in one of the speaker's decisions in May, a motion to reconsider in the House was ruled out of order because notice had not been given. So, apparently, had notice been given it would have been entertained. Therefore, it seems to me the matter is one of great doubt and is decided on the basis of what seems to be reasonable under the circumstances. I can understand that a decision might be arrived at and it might seem reasonable to everybody that it should be reconsidered in the light of subsequent developments. It seems to me wise for the committee to have power under reasonable circumstances to reconsider a previous decision, but I do not want it taken for

granted that these motions can be raised repeatedly and the time of the committee taken up by asking us to reconsider previous motions because obviously in that way we can be prevented from doing anything. Therefore, I want to make it plain that while I am not going to rule this out of order I have very grave doubt whether it is in order and I hope this is not taken as a precedent to make subsequent motions repeatedly.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: It is surely an appeal for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN: No. I think it is the general feeling of the committee they would like to have a chance to consider this and decide on it. I would not say it would be necessary even to have unanimous consent because it says general consent. I think it goes a little further than unanimous consent.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Strictly speaking you have the unanimous consent—strictly speaking.

The CHAIRMAN: I would say this motion is not ruled out of order and is before us.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that the members of this committee are responsible people and have made a decision by a recorded vote less than a month ago and they are not in the habit of changing their minds just over night and even though there has been a change of personnel on this committee I would not anticipate that the purpose of the change of personnel on this committee as we go along is for the purpose of changing the outlook or the attitudes of the committee. So, we have passed on this matter and it seems to me if the chairman can reinstitute a motion from time to time which has been passed it might waste a lot of time to this committee. On that basis I would suggest you rule the motion out of order. In any event I am quite prepared now to vote on the matter.

Mr. HENRY: May the motion be put.

Mr. DECORE: Has anything happened in this committee since the last motion about a month ago which would justify this committee in rescinding the previous decision? I move that the question be put.

Mr. FULTON: That motion is out of order. The previous question cannot be moved in a committee such as this; you will find that in Bourinot.

The CHAIRMAN: I think as a matter of fairness—when we have agreed to entertain the motion my suggestion is that we hear the mover of it. Bearing in mind the fact that this has been repeated over the last month, I hope he will not take too long. I think it would be fair too, to have a word from each of the parties on this motion because if we are going to decide I think it would be only in order to hear the various positions on the matter. I am in your hands, gentlemen. I am under the impression that the previous question cannot be moved in committee. I would suggest anyway that we do hear Mr. Fulton, and Mr. Cameron has something to say, and that we hear somebody from the Social Credit party, Mr. Yuill, appears to wish to speak and then anybody who wishes to speak on behalf of the Liberal members of the committee, and then we will decide.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, I can state quite briefly the merits of the motion. I have no real objection as to whether the previous question is moved or not, because of course it is debatable; although I think you will find it is a motion which can not be made in a committee of this sort.

The purpose of the motion which I have now moved is, I think, quite clear. It is simply to place the committee in a position to call witnesses whom the committee may from time to time decide would be desirable to hear. On that ground alone I would earnestly urge the members of the committee to approve the motion that I have made, because I point out that every time so far that we have made suggestions that certain witnesses be called, regardless of whether

or not the other members of the committee might agree that those witnesses should be called, we have been in the position where you have felt constrained to rule, as a result of the decision arrived at on February 17 that we are prohibited from dealing with motions to call any witnesses. Regardless of whether the committee agrees with me with respect to the witnesses I have sought to bring before the committee, I urge that it is desirable that the committee should place itself in a position where if any member, even one of those disagreeing with the witnesses I have sought to call—if any of these members might want to call another witness he should be able to have that motion heard and considered. At present, he would find himself in the same position I have found myself in. If Mr. Byrne or any other member of the committee wished to suggest that a witness be called at the present time he would find himself out of order in making such a motion. The only way we can change that position is by adopting the present motion. The effect of that motion then would relate, not only to the witnesses whose names have been frequently before the committee—Mr. Taylor and Mr. McDonald—but would give the committee the right to call any other witnesses whether it be in connection with questions of the estimates of this department or any other department.

I want to suggest briefly—and I tell you frankly I shall not be a member of the committee at that time, so I will have no say on it at the time—but it occurs to me that the members of the committee when they review the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the administration of the Pensions Act might wish to hear witnesses from the Canadian Legion who may have suggestions to make as to the administration of the Pensions Act. I am not saying that that will be done, but it seems to me that it should be the sort of thing the committee should be in a position to do. With respect to the consideration of the estimates of this department, if the motion were carried I would suggest, in addition to the two gentlemen I have previously mentioned, that we want to hear Mr. Chris Kelly of Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest you direct yourself to the principal question and not to what we shall do if the motion is decided affirmatively.

Mr. FULTON: That is a little difficult because I am trying to argue the advantages of passing the motion. I am trying to indicate that it would not be related only to the two potential witnesses whose names have been before this committee, but that it would also put us in a position to call other witnesses. I point out that Mr. Kelly was felt to be a sufficiently competent and well-informed person to be called before the Senate standing committee on Immigration and Labour in April 1953, as reported in their proceedings No. 2.

In sumary I think it is most desirable that this committee be in a position where it can call witnesses and call for the production of documents if at any time the committee feels that it would be advantageous to its inquiries and considerations in the matter before it to do so. It cannot do it at the present time as a result of that vote of February 17.

The CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking that is not correct. We cannot do it because we were not given power by the House to do it.

Mr. FULTON: Very well, ... because when it was suggested to the committee that we seek that power from the House that suggestion was voted down and you have subsequently ruled that that matter could not be reopened. So, my motion would have two effects: it would reopen that decision of February 17, and if the second paragraph were carried it would recommend to the House that we be given the power, and then we would have the power after that to send for any witnesses or documents which we desire.

It seems to me that that should carry the support of the members who support the government in this committee as well as of those who do not support the government. But, unless we adopt this motion the committee

is in the position of being able to hear only those witnesses and that evidence which the government decides shall be laid before it. I am quite certain that in considering the setup of this committee it was not the thought of anybody that our enquiry should be limited only to that evidence which the government sees fit to bring before us. So I hope the committee will consider favourably the motion put before it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): One reason I think the committee should support this motion of Mr. Fulton is because of a statement you made the other day, Mr. Chairman. There was a suggestion that if we could not call a witness that we should invite a witness if anybody offered to come and we should hear him, and; you pointed out that might be quite difficult to do unless at the same time we had power to call witnesses on the other side; that it might give an unbalanced picture. I happen to know of one quite prominent barrister in Toronto who would like to appear before this committee. He has handled a great number of immigration cases with a great deal of success, and he has some suggestions to make with respect to the administration of the Act. I would like to see us in a position to accept the offer from such a man.

In the light of what you said the other day I doubt whether we could do so unless we ask the House of Commons to alter their decision. I would point this out to the government supporters on this committee that they are always in the perfectly strong position of being able to prohibit any specific witness appearing though we have the power to call witnesses. It is still entirely in their hands; but I do stress again the point Mr. Fulton made that we might find ourselves in a very difficult position if there should be witnesses whom we may wish to call. You can always shut the door on the specific witnesses, but I suggest you do not shut the door on all the witnesses.

I was always pretty puzzled at the exact position of the departmental witnesses who appear before us. I do not know whether they are witnesses or just happen to be in the room. If they just happened to be in the room then where do we stop?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are an emanation of the minister.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): For these reasons I would support the motion of Mr. Fulton.

Mr. YUILL: I have some concern in this matter and that is whether or not by ruling this motion out of order at the moment it will close the door for all future departmental examinations.

Now, I am not arguing the merits or demerits of the right to have these gentlemen come and bring these documents which might be debated here, but I am vitally concerned about closing the door definitely because in some of the other departmental eaxminations here, when they come up for consideration, it may be necessary and desirable to call for witnesses. I do not say that it is going to happen but I would hate to be hamstrung if we could not be permitted to delve into the matter to the fullest extent. I think it is quite obvious here that these particular witnesses who have been mentioned are deemed to be not serving any too useful purpose. I think we should forget about them. But, I will urge you to consider earnestly the advisability of not closing the door in the future to the calling of any witnesses.

Mr. BYRNE: We have heard the members supporting this motion. I think perhaps it would be simply reiterating the position I have taken previously in that this committee is sitting to determine from the minister and his officials as to how they are spending their money in relation to the legislation as it presently exists. Now there have been complaints about the duplication of services and the duplication of committee work.

Mr. Fulton has mentioned that the veterans affairs committee might want to send for the Legion. There is a veterans affairs committee sitting at the present time and they are, I believe, hearing witnesses. Now, the Pensions Act may come before the veterans affairs committee and they may want to call witnesses.

Mr. FULTON: It won't be before that committee.

Mr. BYRNE: It won't be; but we do not have to change our policy each year; and when they do decide there should be a revision, then they can decide on the various witnesses who may be called.

I am presently a member of the external affairs committee. We decided to allow witnesses to come. But our work has had to be postponed for almost a month. The witnesses cannot appear until the 26th of April.

What sort of morass would this estimates committee get into if we wanted to hear a lawyer from Vancouver, let us say, or a lawyer from Halifax, or one from Toronto? Would we ever get anything done.

I submit that this is a frivolous motion and should be disposed of immediately.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Mr. Chairman I would like to say just a few words regarding the foundation of the motion in law. It seems to me that the jurisprudence stated by Mr. Fulton is an interference with the standing committee, not with the special committee which had no existence surely in 1703, when he cited this case We are not definitely a standing committee, and we are going according to the rules of the House.

If we are in supply, that is, if we are in the House, we have no right to summon witnesses and we have no right to ask for the production of documents. Therefore, I submit that in law this motion is unfounded; it has no foundation at all and I shall certainly vote against it.

Mr. DINSDALE: As a seconder of the motion, I would like to say a few words. I was not on the committee when the previous discussion was held, but I would like to emphasize that, as I understand it, this committee is a pioneer committee. It is intended to assist in the discussion of the estimates. The precedents and the patterns which we establish for this first department, I take it, would more or less determine the future destiny of the committee.

Unless a full inquiry is allowed, I can only see a sense of frustration resulting in extended debate when the departments come before the House; and the fundamental purpose of the committee therefore is lost.

As to the previous motion moved by Mr. Fulton in connection with the episode in Manitoba, at the time it occurred, according to the headlines in the newspapers, it was an important incident in the administration of this department.

I believe that the minister regarded it as such because he went before the Chamber of Commerce at Dauphin and made a rather extended presentation there.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I did not even refer to the incident.

Mr. DINSDALE: The minister dealt with the administration of the Department of Immigration and I think it must have been in connection with the Winnipeg episode.

I am sure that so far as the citizens of Manitoba are concerned, it would allay any suspicions, or any misgivings which they might have on this particular episode if we were allowed, as a committee, to hear some of the evidence which emerged at the Bar Association meetings.

Finally, with the government majority in complete control of the committee, it can only result in it becoming a mutual admiration society rather than a committee to investigate fully and to have complete freedom of inquiry.

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): Did you ever have a committee set up which did not have on it a government majority?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I find the suggestion and plan on the other side very attractive but it seems to me that they are trying to do indirectly something which they should not be allowed to do directly.

We have had certain rules in regard to witnesses whom we may or may not wish to hear. It seems to me if it is a matter of calling witnesses in the way of national organizations, or national associations who wish to make certain representations, that is one thing. But to call an individual lawyer from Toronto or to call twelve hundred members of the bar of the city of Montreal who would like to meet the immigration officials here for the sake of their business, is quite another thing.

If there are any particular ideas which should be brought to the attention of this committee by individual lawyers or other people, surely to goodness they might communicate those ideas to members of this committee. Surely we do not have to waste the time of the committee by listening to twelve hundred lawyers from Montreal. This is not a royal commission. It is a committee on estimates.

So it seems to me that we should restrict ourselves to details of the estimates and inquire about the work from the officials here, and learn about the details of those estimates.

As for the government majority, I submit that is so much eye-wash and is offered for the newspapers. If you will give me a few minutes later on I propose to launch a rather critical matter and to bring up some criticism against the citizenship branch in the city of Montreal. I think this criticism should be brought into the open and brought to the attention of members of this committee.

It is one of the functions of this committee to try to improve conditions. This happened in the city of Montreal, but it could happen in Toronto, Vancouver, or any other place.

I agree with the last definition of my learned friend's motion. It is frivolous, and it is an attempt to do something indirectly which he knows he should not do directly.

Mr. FULTON: That is not the fact. The chairman has agreed that it is perfectly in order.

The CHAIRMAN: You have a motion before you, gentlemen. All those in favour of Mr. Fulton's motion will please raise their hands.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, we might as well have a poll and save time.

The CHAIRMAN: You desire a poll? There is a motion made which is familiar to you. It has been read a couple of times.

It is:

> I move, seconded by Mr. Dinsdale,
>
> 1. That the resolution of the committee come to on Thursday, February 17, 1955 that the committee not seek power to send for persons, papers or records be rescinded.
>
> 2. That the committee recommend to the House that it be empowered to send for persons, papers and records.

Those in favour of Mr. Fulton's motion will, when their names are called, vote yes or yea, and those against will say nay or no.

—(At this point a polled vote was taken).

The CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE: Yeas: 8. Nays: 14.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost, gentlemen.

Now we are on item 60 and 61 of the estimates, at page 12.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
	CITIZENSHIP					
60	Citizenship Registration Branch	143	226,598	221,654	4,944	
61	Citizenship Branch	144	725,323	697,031	28,292	
			951,921	918,685	33,236	

Mr. STARR: I think probably it would be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to introduce the Citizenship officials.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was going to introduce the Citizenship officials if I could just have a word.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one other point I want to mention to the committee. I have still not received from Mr. Taylor the letter which I invited him to send to me indicating whether he is willing to have me. I make those documents public on his responsibility. I wish he would send me, for my own perusal, the two documents which I do not possess, and the contents of which I am still unaware of. I would like to know what these criticisms of his are against my department. Having said that I would now like to introduce the citizenship officers.

Mr. FULTON: That cannot go unanswered, Mr. Chairman. This is the fifth time the minister has contradicted himself as to whether he has seen those documents or not, or knows their contents or not. He has contradicted himself twice in the course of the same speech on previous occasions.

If the minister really is so interested, let him write to Mr. Taylor. It should not be beyond his ability to write a letter. He is fluent and voluble. Yet the fact is that although he has said that Mr. Taylor has previously written to him, he has not yet favoured Mr. Taylor with a reply. In view of that and of the most unfair implications which the minister has tried to raise against Mr. Taylor, it is absurd and nonsense for the minister to suggest that Mr. Taylor should now write to him in reply to some new vague suggestion which the Minister has not the courtesy to reduce to writing and send to Mr. Taylor in written form.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was never in a position to know which the documents were to which Mr. Taylor was referring until Mr. Fulton read in this committee the letter from Mr. Taylor with the postscript which gave the dates of those documents.

I want to get this clear because it has been suggested not only in this committee but elsewhere that I have not been telling the truth about this matter. I want to make this point abundantly clear however this time, that when I saw the postscript to Mr. Taylor's letter to Mr. Fulton, that was the first time I could identify for sure what those documents were.

I checked my files and I found that I had two documents bearing July dates which corresponded to two of the dates Mr. Taylor mentioned. But I did

not have the other two; and to the best of my knowledge and that of my deputy, we have not had them at any time.

I understand that those two documents are supposed to contain charges against my department and I would like to see them. That is the whole story and I wanted it straight.

If we could now take item 60, first, the citizenship registration branch, we have Mr. Duggan who is the head of that branch and Mr. Bussiere the head of the Canadian citizenship branch.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you just identify them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Duggan will please stand up. And Mr. Bussiere, Mr. Brennan and Mr. Abbott also are here from the administration branch to assist with information.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Chairman might I introduce the critical matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the minister and his officers.

It has to do particularly with the city of Montreal and district, and it should be a matter of general interest. I would like to get the cooperation of would like to see it in the press. I would like to clear up a situation which should be cleaned up as speedily as possible.

I am well aware that the department knows of the situation, but for years now—at least 30 years—this situation has existed and I submit that the time has now come to bring it out into the open and try to get a little done in the way of cleaning up a deplorable situation in the city and district of Montreal.

Mr. FULTON: Are you not anxious to get this into the newspapers?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I am not primarily concerned with that, although I would like to see it in the press. Iwould like to clear up a situation which should be cleared up. This is not being done for publicity purposes. I have known of it for years but have not been able to get at it until now.

In the city of Montreal, which is one of the ports of entry for newly arrived immigrants to Canada, the citizenship branch tries to operate in two rooms in the basement of the court house annex on St. James Street. The two rooms in question are small, ill-ventilated, and ill-lighted; and the two officials who process these applications for citizenship to Canada receive as many as one hundred and fifty people a day.

The net consequence is that you have perhaps one hundred people waiting out in a damp, ill-lit corridor of the basement of the court house annex. This situation has grown up for a long time. I checked the statistics very recently and they show that from 40 to 50 petitions are garnted weekly by this one officer who handles the whole volume of work. This officer sits about 40 weeks during the year, so the net result is that you have about 1600 petitions granted per year.

If the man is lucky enough, he is able to get an empty courtroom on Friday afternoons and Saturday mornings; and if he is lucky enough also he can try to secure a judge who is good enough to come and listen to some of those petitions.

In fact the only possibility of the hearing of many of these applications by a judge is perhaps on a Friday afternoon in an empty courtroom, or on some Saturday morning, which, of course, cuts down the turnover.

In 1953 in the city and district of Montreal twenty-three hundred applications were received by this one officer. In 1954, forty-two hundred applications were received, and in 1955, in January and February, nine hundred applications have been received.

The result is that as of today hearings are only now being held on applications which were received from the first of January, 1954. There is a backlog

of applications to be heard in Montreal of forty-two hundred applications for 1954 plus nine hundred applications for 1955, making a total of fifty-one hundred applications in the present backlog.

If you assume that we can hear sixteen hundred applications a year, it thus will take five years before the present backlog will be heard in the city of Montreal. If you assume—and if it is right to assume—that in 1955 there will be an estimated six thousand new applications, then if you add the 1954 and the 1955 figures, the five thousand plus the six thousand, you will get eleven thousand applications in the city and district of Montreal, less the sixteen hundred heard during the year; so at the end of 1955 you will have ten thousand unheard applications as a backlog in the city and district of Montreal.

The effect of this is that you disinfranchise newly arrived Canadians. Furthermore you create two classes of Canadians; Canadians who are here and the newly arrived Canadians. You can split the newly arrived Canadians into two classes too. It is not a wise thing to do, although in practical effect you do it. The newly arrived Canadians in effect will have to wait from six to eight years before they can qualify.

The effect, there, is to have a selection in our immigrants such as professional people coming from Europe, or people with special merit or skill. Trades people are badly needed in certain industries in this country. It means that they will have to wait from six to eight years before they can qualify.

I happen to know that in the case of Canadair they needed certain specialists, but these people could not be hired by Canadair because they were not Canadians and could not be taken on the payroll. So in fact they would have to wait for six or ten years before they could qualify in order to get a job. And the same applies to professional people and skilled trades people.

I have heard of cases of newly arrived Canadians who wanted to join the armed forces, but they could not do so because the armed forces would not take them until they had their Canadian citizenship.

It is extremely hard on certain classes of persons who anticipate, when they leave Europe, looking to a certain amount of justice which they are entitled to receive from our courts in the city and district of Montreal.

The end result has been to create a good deal of resentment. In passing I must say that there appears to be two standards.

A lawyer, as is his right, will know the court people and he can walk in and demand a hearing from those officials. After all this is our own court house and it is for the use for our lawyers and they have certain rights in the court house, so it is difficult for the officials to refuse. Therefore, it may happen that they may take a person past one hundred and fifty other applicants waiting in the hall, and have a hearing given for that one person. Of course this has created a good deal of resentment and it is something which should be corrected immediately.

I know that the department has a great deal of difficulty with provincial authorities in asking for or demanding office space. So far it has not been provided, and I say that if the provincial authorities will not provide it, then the department itself should go out and get other premises, even if it does cost them money.

The judges in the Montreal area are hard working and they frequently have too much to do. If some of those judges sit by preference on these naturalization cases, they are doing so through goodwill and in an endeavour to reduce the amount of backlog.

Under the Immigration Act, as I understand it, section 34 subsection 2, paragraph (*b*) the department has the right.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean under the Citizenship Act, I think.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Yes, under the Citizenship Act, the department has the right to appoint officers or officials, if they so desire, to hear and grant

petitions. It seems to me that in our local area where the judges have so much to do that the department should use those provisions and appoint an officer or an official who could do the administrative part of this job, leaving it to the judge to administer the oath and to grant the certificate. They could speed up the services in this way.

Twenty years ago I was vice-president of the Young Men's Canadian Club in Montreal and we went into this whole subject as well as we could at the time and submitted a long proposal to the Honourable Mr. Charles Cahan who was the secretary of state at that time and in charge of this department.

We said we thought that the immodest ceremony and the activities in the particular courts in Montreal at which the newly arrived Canadians were examined and passed—with the certificates being sent by mail—should be altered, and that we should dramatize the system of granting citizenship to newly arrived Canadians. Perhaps we should not go as far as the Americans go, but we pointed out the fact that Canadian citizenship is one of the most valuable things anyone can acquire anywhere today, and that we should make the newly arrived prospective Canadian citizens feel that this was a great thing they were being given in the court, and that it was a great opportunity.

Certain small improvements have been made. At the present time I believe they have two red-coated mounted policemen in the court at the time the judge goes up on the bench, but that is not good enough. It does not make the required impression that should be made when a person receives his citizenship from a country like this.

So I suggest that in cooperation with the local authorities in Montreal and across Canada, if it is desired, a special ceremony be worked out so that the newly arrived Canadian can realize to some extent the great privilege he is being granted.

I do not wish to detain the committee further, but I would like to make the following suggestions to your department:

1. That you appoint an officer or officers to process the hearing of these applications and get to work on this backlog of ten thousand applications which will be piled up by the end of this year.

2. That you ask the judges, or appoint judges if necessary—and give them extra remuneration—to grant the oath and the certificates of citizenship with a proper ceremonial.

3. That you institute a new and proper ceremonial.

4. And this is by no means the least important, that you provide greater staff for processing these thousands of applications, and that if you cannot get proper offices from the provincial government or from the Department of Justice, that you take action yourself and go out and rent premises and do something about this terrible backlog of cases that we have in the city and district of Montreal. And I submit that this should be done immediately.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Starr will be next.

Mr. STARR: I have a series of questions, Mr. Chairman, but I realize that I cannot monopolize the time of the committee all at once.

The CHAIRMAN: Do they deal directly with this matter?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are they on the same subject?

Mr. STARR: No, no.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Michener would like to speak on the same point.

Mr. MICHENER: I should like to speak to this point, if Mr. Starr will allow me. The problem in the county of York is even more acute.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is worse.

Mr. MICHENER: It is worse even than in Montreal; and as the minister will recall, I raised the question in the House a few days ago, because it had been brought to my attention recently, only recently. I do not know haw far back it goes, but it seems to me that it is, like a snowball, a problem which has piled up until now it requires attention urgently.

I heard about it from citizens, and from residents of the city, who have been waiting an undue time for their certificates. As every member of the committee will appreciate when a person wishes to come to this country and has met all the requirements, he is entitled to that very much anticipated prize, his certificate of citizenship. It is his franchise which gives him his status here. He will be naturally concerned that it is not forthcoming within a reasonable time.

Of course there is a certain waiting period of three months after the application is made. Everyone appreciates that all these things cannot be attended to at once. But it seems to me the point is well taken that it is inapproprite to rely upon the county courts to handle the applications in the number that are now pending.

I think it is quite proper in most counties or places in Canada to use the existing machinery. It is economical. The county court judge in a small community where there are few immigrants arriving can handle them. I know that the minister will deal with this problem and he has so indicated in the House. But it would not do any harm to indicate some of the considerations that should be borne in mind in his dealing with it.

I have estimated that 40 thousand immigrants have arrived in Toronto. Perhaps Mr. Henry would agree with that as a rough estimate. The number is given honestly.

Mr. HENRY: I think that number may be about right.

Mr. MICHENER: The minister told me last year that the number of certificates granted in the county of York last year was four thousand. It is apparent that before long we are going to have something in the neighbourhood of 40 thousand certificates to be granted. It may amount to 15 thousand this year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think we anticipate 15 thousand applications this year. I hope there will be 15 thousand certificates issued.

Mr. MICHENER: The snowball is growing and it may get up to 40 thousand; and if immigration continues as we hope it will, we may anticipate 40 thousand.

It is apparent that the machinery of the county courts cannot handle that volume, no matter how they may try and how willing they are to do it. I know from experience, and from lawyers in busy counties now, that the county court judges are pretty well occupied with legal business. They have their own work to do as well as the odd commission and other jobs here and there. They simply have not got the time to hear these hundreds of applications for citizenship and to see whether the applicants know the English language sufficiently, and are qualified to be recommended for registration.

Then the judges come in again. After they have recommended the application and the registrar has accepted the recommendation and granted the certificates, then the applicants are sworn in, when the oath is administered, and that is also done by the judges. I think it was suggested by Mr. Macnaughton that the preliminary hearing and so on might be done by some other qualified persons in accordance with the powers already in the Act, but I do believe that the authority of the judge should be retained for the administering of the oath of loyalty, the citizens' oath. It seems to me that is something the judges can do even in the busiest centres and could probably arrange to deal with in quantity. There is an advantage in dealing with these matters in quantity. When I was attending the United Nations Assembly last year there was a great ceremony in the New York area when 5,000 people

I think simultaneously took the oath. There was quite a bit of newspaper publicity and a good deal of dignified ceremony about the admission of this group to citizenship which impressed what was happening not only on the minds of the new citizens but also on the public generally. They, I think, should be encouraged to attend, that is all Canadian citizens, to take interest and extend appreciation of their new fellow citizens.

If the judge can be retained in that capacity and some effort made by the department in periods of maximum density—if I may use that word—to organize a ceremonial, the minister might find it is advantageous to appear on such occasions and neglect his province of Newfoundland for the moment. It seems to me either the minister or some official of the department or perhaps some local dignitaries, should be pressed into service to make this an occasion of special ceremony. This is probably something that the minister is quite ready to accept and there is no point in taking the time of the committee, but it is a matter of great significance to a lot of people in these two centres at least, and I am hopeful we will improve the situation so that it becomes something impressive and memorable.

Mr. HENRY: When Mr. Mitchener speaks of Canadian citizenship as he does I am sure he reflects the feelings of all sides on this committee. I am sure citizenship is something we can agree to promote to the fullest possible extent and, speaking for the city of Toronto as one of the members from that city, I concur particularly in his urging of the further ceremonial in connection with this matter.

The I.O.D.E. and other citizenship groups have done very good work in promoting ceremonial at "Citizenship Court Sessions" from time to time and I think that should be encouraged further by the department. I was impressed by the work of Mr. Pickersgill's predecessor in this respect because he did give considerable encouragement to the I.O.D.E. and other citizenship groups in this connection. I think it should go further and be planned. It seems to me that the judge who would be giving citizenship certificates to a group of citizens might very well on that occasion be given the responsibility of making an address which would receive widespread publicity in the press, something akin to the trial judge opening court with his address to a "Grand Jury". This is something which stimulates interest in the institutions which the judge represents.

I would go a step further in this matter. We do feel that there is some lack of knowledge on the part of new Canadians as to how to go about obtaining Canadian citizenship. What forms are to be completed? And what officials are to be consulted for this purpose?

It seems to me that this branch is somewhat self liquidating from the "cost" standpoint and does receive funds at the local levels from the applicants for citizenship, and I would like the minister to speak about what has been obtained from the individual applicants in Toronto, and what the total amount of funds may be in Toronto. We may find within the framework of that fund enough money to have a public relations section and give ethnic groups some tutoring so to speak on the question of filling out the forms and this will promote applications for citizenship at the local level.

I think there is room, Mr. Minister, for some activity in the procedural sense as well as the ceremonial sense, and I am very glad that my friend from Toronto, Mr. Michener, raised this matter in the House of Commons because I think he has done service to the community. I do not always agree with everything he says, but when he talks on this question of citizenship it is a pleasure to endorse his remarks.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I realize that some problems make it difficult in these large areas to try to do it on a ceremonial level, but in the less populated areas I am pleased to report there is much made of it. In my two counties I find

it is one of the important functions in the court during the year. The service clubs usually send representatives who present the new citizens with either the Bible upon which they were sworn or some book on Canadian history or something of that kind, and invariably civic officials attend and as often as possible even a high school class is given an opportunity to attend court to hear the judge's address and to see the presentation of new citizenship certificates.

It just occurred to me that if the county judges in and near Toronto and Montreal are as heavily worked as I take it they are it may be that some of the judges from nearby counties could assist in the work for a short period of time. I am sure that some of them would not object to going to Montreal or Toronto for a week at a time to assist in this particular work.

Mr. STARR: My question is asked as a basis for any questions I may have or others may have and that was to ask Mr. Duggan to outline the requirements and the procedure for a new arrival up to the point where he applies for citizenship.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wonder if I could deal with this situation in Toronto and Montreal unless someone else wishes to say something about it.

Mr. FULTON: I would like to say something about the matter of the ceremony, as raised by Mr. Macnaughton.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Then I could deal with that at the same time.

Mr. FULTON: I was going to make a suggestion that the ceremony be made more impressive and one which would facilitate the gathering of those who are already Canadian citizens at the ceremony, to welcome the new citizens. I would appreciate the comments of the minister and any other members who agree or disagree. I suggest that some directive should be issued that the ceremony be divided into two parts. One, the routine inquiry which takes place at the time the oath is administered because the judge has to satisfy himself as to the applicant's qualifications to speak English, his knowledge of Canada and so on, and many of the immigrants, I would conclude, find it a little embarassing, particularly if they are asked these questions in front of a reasonably large audience, and especially if they are elderly and don't speak English well. Then too, if there is a large number of applicants, it is fairly time-consuming. I do not want to minimize the importance of this portion of the process, but using the word in its proper sense it is rather routine; and I wonder if it would not be appropriate to divide the ceremony into two parts. First might be the interrogation by the judge and administration of the oath, and then at a later time in the day, preferably in the evening, there might a further civic function at which the applicants who have been found qualified and taken the oath appear with all the appropriate ceremony. The Americans do this thing so well, and we might take a leaf out of their book. Then, with a large audience, and people seated in the body of the hall and appropriate community and civic representatives up on the stage, at that time the judge might make his address and then there would be the formal ceremony of presenting these certificates.

In that way I think you would have the potential embarrassment and somewhat routine aspect which surrounds the actual investigation, removed from the ceremony of presentation of the certificates which could then be done with appropriate dignity and impressiveness. It is just a suggestion I make based on personal observation. I think particularly where you are dealing with fairly large classes of those applying for certificates it might be one method of getting an impressive, dignified ceremony which would impress on those people that it is a high privilege they are being accorded in having these certificates handed to them.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I would like to emphasize that some of these things cannot be applied universally across the country. It took me quite a number of years to convince the officials of this department that it is a great hardship to ask working men to come to a county seat that is some 300 miles from where they live for the sole purpose of completing an affidavit before a junior officer of the court. I pointed out that it was a very expensive trip and that that kind of thing could be done by some local justice of the peace in the area in which they lived. Similarly if the ceremony is divided every effort should be taken to complete it in one working day.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I might say a word now I would like to deal first with the situation in Toronto and Montreal. I will deal with both of them together because while I think the situation certainly is worse in Toronto than it is in Montreal I do not know that it is proportionately worse. In fact they are both so bad I would find it very hard to discriminate between them. There is no doubt of that whatsoever. I asked my predecessor about section 34, subsection 2 of the Citizenship Act empowering the Governor in Council to take this thing into his own hands and he assured me that was put in the Act in June 1953 for the express purpose of dealing, if it became necessary, with just such situations as this.

You may ask, if this is as bad as it is painted—and it is—why has the department tolerated it for so long. It is a rather delicate matter because as I think all the members of the Committee understand parliament has imposed these functions upon provincial institutions, the courts, the county courts and in the province of Quebec the magistrate's court over which we have no jurisdiction whatsoever.

Mr. MICHENER: That is hardly correct. The judges are appointed by the federal government.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not in the magistrate's court in the province of Quebec. When I said we had no jurisdiction I was only referring to the magistrate's court. We have no control over the administration of the county or district courts in the other provinces either, although we do provide them with judges and pay the salaries of the judges. The fees do not go to the federal government at all; they go to the court. We can when necessary, suggest that these courts provide better service. But we have no way whatsoever of compelling it. I do not want to suggest for one minute one word of criticism of either the provincial governments or the local courts in what I say. I am just going to try to give the facts as plainly as I can. The fact is that the officials in Toronto, Mr. Winchester the clerk of the peace and all the county court judges, have been most cooperative but there is a physical limit to what human beings can do each day; and they occupy quarters which I do not think are at all appropriate for this kind of purpose. I saw some of these hearings taking place in a little shack, if I may so describe it, that was built under a stairway in the city hall in Toronto. The applicants were sitting on benches in one part of this little shack, and then there was a little cubicle where the judge sat and the applicants were taken in one at a time to be interrogated. Well, I was not very proud of it.

It happened that I was in Toronto on that particularly day for the purpose of looking at some real estate which the Minister of Public Works had told me was going to become vacant during the month of March—this was in February —and he said that if it suited me I could have it. My first idea was to offer the space to the provincial and local authorities and let them carry on the duties under the Act. I had discussions with the senior judge of the county court and I had discussions with the attorney general of Ontario and ultimately we came quite amicably, and with the utmost cooperation, to the conclusion that the only effective way of remedying this situation was for the federal government to take the responsibility and do it ourselves. The federal office is in the process

of being furnished and staffed at the present moment and we expect to receive applications from April 1st on and to appoint the necessary examiners—we have not decided what we will call them—to do the interrogating, and the only function which the judge will be asked to perform is the oath-taking after the application has come here and been approved. We have quarters at a very convenient location, at the corner of Bay and Bloor Streets which is practically the main axis of Toronto, a very convenient place, in a decent building where I think there will be room enough to have some of the ceremonies which have to be held pretty frequently in Toronto. We will from time to time also try to have ceremonies organized on a somewhat larger scale, such as the one that the Lieutenant-Governor was kind enough recently to preside over in the city hall.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Minister, are you looking for a place in Montreal also?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I want to say about Montreal that I communicated with the attorney general of Quebec, who also happens to be the premier of that province, as my predecessor had done and there is the same difficulty there precisely. The other day—about a week ago I think—I wrote to the premier of Quebec and told him that I was withdrawing my request for additional facilities in the magistrates' court, that we had come to the conclusion that the only way to solve this problem in Montreal was the way we had taken in Toronto; and I asked the Minister of Public Works to provide us with premises in Montreal and the deputy tells me he is going to have a look at quarters on Saturday, unless this committee should sit on Saturday which I pray it will not.

The CHAIRMAN: It is an idea.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, we can hope to get established in Montreal quite as quickly as in Toronto because we have not yet actually got premises and that is the first thing.

I think that I should at this time—and I am sure Mr. Macnaughton would agree with me—say how devoted Mr. Robitaille, the clerk of the Magistrates' Court has been. He has worked very hard under the circumstances and has done just as much as humanly possible; but again it is really quite disgraceful that people who have come to Canada and who have qualified to be citizens should be held up sometimes a year or more, sometimes perhaps two years, simply because no one has been able to provide the necessary administrative facilities. You may ask why the department did not take over from the provincial authorities as soon as the Act was amended? It was not done as soon as the Act was passed because my predecessor felt that it was preferable to use the existing facilities if suitable arrangements could be made and he made one last earnest effort to do it that way. When the problem fell on my door step, I consulted my predecessor, as I do about all the difficult problems in this department, and he said he thought I ought to go ahead and do what he certainly would have done had he stayed in the department longer. I do not want anyone to think that there is any difference between us in this matter. He has given me the utmost cooperation in getting it done, and I need his cooperation because he is the Minister of Finance.

In Toronto we estimate we can make money, and I doubt if we will lose it in Montreal, with the $10 fee which we will collect. The volume is so great that the work will be continuous.

Mr. CANNON: Will there be any arrangements made about the $10 fee which now goes to the provincial authorities?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You may be sure we are going to keep the fees if we are going to pay the expenses; no one would expect anything different.

As I say, I would like Mr. Thatcher particularly to know we would not expect to increase the cost. We will increase next year's estimates because of the way we do bookkeeping in the government where we are not allowed

to offset receipts against expenditures and put the net in the estimates. But I do not think these operations in Toronto and Montreal will cost the taxpayers anything and I think they may do a little better than pay for themselves.

You may say why do we not do it all over the country? We do not because, as Mr. Benidickson has indicated by his comments about Kenora and Fort Frances, it would be hopelessly expensive because of the relatively small number of applicants in smaller places. In the local courts where the judges can do it at their convenience the revenue is that much additional revenue to the local authorities. It pays for the actual service but we could not perform the service without great additional cost. It is not desirable that we should extend this direct federal activity anywhere where it is not absolutely necessary.

Mr. FULTON: Do you have a similar pressing situation in any other centres in Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am informed that we have not. Mr. Duggan says not. I wondered whether some of the other large centres like Hamilton, Winnipeg and Vancouver might be in a similar position, but apparently the facilities are more adequate in those places in relation to the numbers.

Mr. FULTON: And it may be that the numbers are not as great.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Certainly not so great. The great concentrations are in Toronto and Montreal. Coming to the ceremony—

Mr. BENIDICKSON: May I say that some of the consequences of delay as outlined by Mr. Macnaughton, are so onerous that I feel we should actually inquire in the courts in some of these cities as to whether the situation exists. I do not think that the officials should, just in the absence of complaints, feel that it is all right. I feel that it is possible in some of these other cities that we are not processing applications as fast as we should.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would say that I would welcome any member of the committee or any member of parliament or anyone bringing any such situation in any part of the country to my notice. I will do everything I can by exhortation and beseeching and any other way I can to persuade the local authorities to deal with it promptly.

But that is our experience, with the exception of these two places, and in Toronto and Montreal it is not lack of good will but sheer lack of facilities and personnel. In these two cases, as I say, I think we have just got to undertake the responsibility with federal officials and do the job. That is what we are proposing to do.

The CHAIRMAN: You did not say when you expected to get it under way in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I hate to be put in the position of posing as a prophet, Mr. Chairman. People are always asking what is going to happen on such and such a date. Perhaps I was a civil servant for too long. I am cautious. But, I notice that most of these targets are not met. We will get it done in Montreal just as soon as we can. There will not be any lack of zeal on the part of the department.

About the ceremonies, probably Mr. Fulton was under a slight misapprehension. It is not possible for the same person on the same day to have his interrogation and take the oath, because after his interrogation the papers have to be sent down here to Ottawa. But I suspect that, in some of these smaller courts, they take all the people at one stage and then the oaths of the other people available, and do it all at once. I think it would be very much better to have them on separate occasions and make the most of the oath taking ceremony. In that respect perhaps I can repay a little of a debt of gratitude I will never be able to completely repay — and Mr. Mcnaughton is in a similar case with me in this—to the I.O.D.E. by expressing appreciation

of the wonderful work they are doing right across this country in organizing these ceremonies and encouraging others to participate. I single out the I.O.D.E., and I do not think it is invidious to do that. They did really start it. In most cases where this work has got under way there are a great many other organizations who have joined with the I.O.D.E. I do not think there is any more useful thing that the multiplicity of fine voluntary organizations we have in this country can do than make these ceremonies a success and make these people who have just become Canadians feel this is a really red letter day in their lives.

I am going down to my native county, on the 4th of April unless I have to appear before this committee on that day, to the town of Simcoe to attend one of these ceremonies. The county of Norfolk, I think, as most members know has been one of the largest rural receivers of immigrants in Canada. There are a very large number of people who will receive their certificates on that date. I felt that I would like to be there, where my ancestors settled as immigrants in 1793.

I think that really completes this point.

Mr. STARR: This booklet answers my questions on Immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERGILL: I wonder if the members of the committee would each like to have a copy of this booklet. I understand we have sent for them.

Mr. MICHENER: I am going to suggest that the minister bring here the complete range of literature which is available for the instruction of immigrants and ask him to run through it so that we can see what it is. I think it would be good for the committe to know what efforts are being made to help the immigrants.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: When we come to the Citizenship Branch I intend to do that. This is the Citizenship Registration branch. There will be no difficulty about doing that. If these booklets are worth distributing to the public I do not think it would be a waste of money to give every member of the committee a copy.

Mr. MICHENER: I see there is quite a large fund for films and displays and I think we ought to be taken through that and shown what is being done.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Could we try to finish with Mr. Duggan and then get on with the Citizenship branch.

Mr. STARR: Does requirement for citizenship come under Mr. Duggan?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. His is the formal side of Citizenship. The Citizenship branch has to do with promotional activities.

Mr. STARR: One of the requirements in No. 5 says: he must have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship. I would like to ask the minister whether there are any facilities supplied by the Citizenship branch to provide this amterial, either by sending it directly to the applicant upon his formal application in order to help him in acquainting himself with Canadian citizenship and what is required of him, or is it passed on to voluntary agencies who in turn do that, or how is it done?

Mr. FORTIER: We distribute the Canadian citizenship series which come under vote 61 and this is distributed in the classes organized by the provinces and is also distributed through the facilities of voluntary agencies throughout Canada.

Mr. STARR: In that respect I am sure that would not reach everyone. It would probably reach a certain percentage of those people who may contemplate applying for citizenship. Would it not be a good practice that when an application for citizenship is received that that applicant be, through the mail, forwarded on this information so that he can read up on it and acquaint himself?

Mr. FORTIER: We do that on request. At the time he applies for citizenship he is supposed to have all the qualifications for citizenship.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that would be late in the day. What the Citizenship branch tries to do is to get this material through the various channels to the immigrants at an early stage in their life in Canada and have these facilities at their disposal, the literature or the classes or films which may assist them. But the applicant is not supposed to make his application until he has been here for five years and by the time he is applying for citizenship it is very late in the day to start instruction in languages and citizenship.

Mr. STARR: Is this basic information supplied in the English and French languages only?

Mr. FORTIER: We have one book called "Handbook for Newcomers" which is distributed in five languages.

Mr. STARR: What are the languages?

Mr. FORTIER: German, Dutch, Italian, French and English.

Mr. STARR: One of the requirements for citizenship, of course, is a knowledge of either French or English. I know that there are some applicants who are in the ages where it is almost an impossibility for them to learn. They may have come over here on the application of a husband or wife and then apply for citizenship papers and appear before a judge who may make a notation that they cannot speak English and the judge may leave it open to the department about the granting of the certificate.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You are referring to subsection 1 (*e*) which says: "He has an adequate knowledge of either the English or the French language, or, if he has not such an adequate knowledge, he has resided continuously in Canada for more than twenty years."

Mr. STARR: But you have cases now of people who are coming over here at the age of 50 or 60, wives who are brought over here by husbands who are Canadian citizens, who after five years make application, and I do know that in some cases a judge marks down that they cannot speak English.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am told very few applications are turned down. Most of these judges are quite human and I think that if the applicant can say "God save the Queen" or something like that they do not usually enquire very much further in cases like those. I would hope that was the case. I say quite frankly I would hope that a woman of 60 who had come to this country five years before, especially those with families, would not be denied citizenship just because they did not have enough contact with other people to learn English or French well. You and I, Mr. Starr, have had some experiences in common and we know people like that who can speak only a little English are just as good citizens as we are.

Mr. STARR: That is right, and that is why I say this. In other words the department would not turn down an application where a notation was made by the judge with the remarks that this person could not speak English.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We sometimes send them back and suggest to the judge that he might give them a further examination. Actually if that notation was put on I think we would be obliged to turn the application down, but we try—

Mr. FULTON: My own observation is that the judges try awfully hard to find it possible to say that they do speak English.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. I think that is the spirit of the law if not exactly the letter of the law. I am not a lawyer and do not want to encourage the judges to misinterpret the law, though I am sure the judges would not pay undue attention to what a minister said, because they have the responsibility themselves.

Mr. STARR: There was some difficulty a few years ago where applicants for Canadian citizenship came from that part of Russia which is Ukraine; they had some difficulty in putting down their nationality as Ukraine. It was insisted they put it down as citizen of the U.S.S.R. to which they had a great many objections. I think it has been rectified.

Mr. FORTIER: The representation which we received was that they did not want to be described on the certificates as citizens of the U.S.S.R. We had it deleted on the citizenship certificate. We now only make mention of the place of birth. In fact, I saw some of them about two months ago and they were very satisfied with it.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there still a stock list of questions which the judges ask?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I object to such a practice. I think that would be a very reprehensible practice.

Mr. MICHENER: They memorize the answers and sometimes you get very extraordinary results. Some of the information is not up to date. There was a case this year of a chap giving the name of Mitchell Hepburn as the Premier of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Some memories die hard.

Mr. HENRY: On that point I have had constituents of mine who were new Canadians and who have said that Mackenzie King was the best "King" we ever had.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I listened for about 20 minutes at that place in Toronto I described a while ago and some of the answers were really rather odd. I have had some experience in this field.

During Mr. Bennett's regime, I asked my freshmen class at Wesley College, where they were brighter than they are in many of our universities, who the Prime Minister of Canada was and out of a class of 20 there were 3 who did not know, and again there were 5 who did not know Mr. Bracken was the premier of Manitoba although he had been premier for ten years at that time and that is why when someone who has only been in the country for five years is not able to answer some of these questions I do not feel that it is a necessary disqualification. If it is a young person it should be; because the young people do have opportunities to learn these things. But for some of these older people it is a difficult process when they are busy trying to get a living and get established and they may not have time to learn much about these things. If their character is good and they are otherwise good people, I do not know that we ought to be too insistent.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this an appropriate place to turn to the declaration of intention?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Last session we amended the Act to make it unnecessary to file a declaration of intention and I wonder whether it is still optional.

Mr. FORTIER: Yes. It is not a requirement under the Act, but a person may file a declaration of intention under regulation 2 of the Act.

Mr. MICHENER: Have you come to any conclusion as a result of one year's experience as to whether we should or should not depart from that form of practice?

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Michener, it has helped lots of people to acquire citizenship sooner. Sometimes they were thinking of applying for citizenship after they had been five years in Canada and under the previous procedure they had to wait one year after the time they had made their declaration, therefore, postponing the hearing for 15 months.

Mr. MICHENER: I appreciate that.

Mr. FORTIER: In fact we are satisfied it had good results.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one advantage in it. In certain cases—I do not know too much about this—possibly if one wanted to get in the civil service and there was no Canadian citizen available they would take a kinder view if they thought the applicant was going to become a Canadian. It might also influence certain other potential employers.

Mr. FULTON: What consideration, if any, has the department given to imposing a time limit in which an immigrant must apply for Canadian citizenship? Have you given any consideration to that at all? It seems proper to accept as a general principle that when an immigrant comes to Canada we want him not only to assume in fact the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship but also to assume them in form as well. Then there are certain investigations which have to be made in connection with an application for citizenship and it occurred to me it might serve a useful purpose from that point of view also, if you made some time limit within which an immigrant must indicate his intention to apply or explain why he has not. Has that point ever been considered?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That really is the same question, in slightly different form, as the one Mr. Monteith asked the other day about Americans in Alberta. I have never heard that it was very seriously considered. In the United States they do have certain regulations about immigrants seeking employment, I believe, but we have always wanted to keep people in this country, not to increase the difficulty of keeping them, and I do think this would tend to have that effect. My own view would be—and I am here stating my own view because I have never discussed this with any of my colleagues nor given it any real thought except when Mr. Monteith brought it up the other day—my own view is most of us think this country is a pretty attractive country to live in and we would rather have people come to that conclusion voluntarily and on their own than to have any element of compulsion put upon them.

Mr. STARR: Has any consideration been given by the government to extend family allowances earlier to new Canadian families who come here; they have to wait a year for them now.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. That has been considered. I have discussed it with my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I have perhaps a slightly notorious familiarity with the origin of family allowances and I remember that at the time the Act was passed it was felt that should not be paid until people had been here a year to prevent payment of family allowances to what might be called transients. There was a fear in those days that a family might come here for six months when there was unemployment elsewhere or send their children here for the summer and collect family allowances for two or three months. Family allowances are now paid, for example, to Americans who work and pay taxes in the United States but who live in Canada and have no intention of becoming Canadian citizens.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to raise a question about the plight of some of the allied Polish war veterans who came out in 1946 and 1947. They came as a group on a two year basis and then after the end of two years were given the right to elect to stay or go back to Europe. Then there were some changes in the law with respect to domicile and residence which had the effect of delaying the right to citizenship of those who stayed so there were some who had been here 7 years and had not citizenship. Are there any of that group who are still ineligible for citizenship registration?

Mr. FORTIER: In 1947 a group of Polish veterans were admitted to this country on a contract with the Department of Labour who, if they were staying on the job for two years to which they had been assigned, were entitled to ask

for a landing, or to put it the other way, to ask to be admitted to Canada as an immigrant for permanent residence. The Department of Labour has made a close check with these people and reminded them that they were entitled to ask for a landing. Fortunately some of them did not apply for the landing until 1953 and 1952. When the law was changed on the 1st June, 1953, they had to acquire Canadian domicile to become a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there any of them who are still ineligible for the registration as citizens at this late date?

Mr. FORTIER: There may be a few who have been landed and have not yet acquired Canadian domicile.

Mr. MICHENER: It seems to me that that is a matter which the department might very well rectify by some extraordinary act.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would require a change in the statute.

Mr. MICHENER: These people by the reason of the change in domicile, requiring five years domicile before they can apply for citizenship, were postponed because their domicile only began when they elected and were landed.

Mr. FORTIER: If they had followed the instructions given them by the department of Labour every one of them would have been considered on the 1st of June, 1953, for citizenship.

Mr. MICHENER: I appreciate that, but it seems to me that if they stayed here and became Canadians that the minister might feel that consideration may be made.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am giving consideration to two or three problems that have come to my attention in regard to citizenship with a possible view to amendments next session, but I have not yet found anything which seems to me to be sufficiently urgent to warrant an attempt to do anything at this session.

Mr. MICHENER: We have abolished the need for the notice of intention to apply and it is the failure of these Polish war veterans to do that kind of thing which keeps them still ineligible.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was their original failure to apply for a landing.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, and after nine years it seems to me they have the right to get their papers and that they should be able to get them.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have some of the most extraordinarily anomalous cases. I can cite one. It is a case of a young man who always thought he was a Canadian but who was born in the United Kingdom though his parents were Canadian. Though he had lived in Canada most of his life, he had never done anything to establish his domicile here. He got a scholarship in the United Kingdom and his mother went back at the time he got the scholarship to live in the United Kingdom where she had lived when he was born, and now he finds he is a citizen of the United Kingdom, and there is just nothing under the law which can be done about it, although in every conceivable way except in law he is a Canadian. I have looked at this case with the greatest care and the greatest sympathy. Then, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has pointed out to me a case of someone in the government service—not in his department but in another department—who has done almost all his service outside of the country. He is a British subject, otherwise he would not be in the service. But, he has never satisfied the technical qualifications for Canadian citizenship. Every so often you do get hard cases because this statute is of course the antithesis of the Immigration Act. One gives the minister great discretion, and the other no discretion.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Chairman, must an applicant possess all the requirements at pages 7 and 8 needed on application for citizenship? Must he

possess all of them? Suppose he did not have adequate knowledge of English and French, would his application be turned down on account of not possessing the proper requirement?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. DUPUIS: He must possess all of them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He must possess an adequate knowledge, but it is for the judge to say what is adequate.

Mr. DUPUIS: Suppose he would fill all the other requirements but lacked one which is number four, will he be refused, if he has all the other requirements, by the lack of adequate knowledge of English or French? Will he be turned down as a result of not having all the requirements?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right, but it depends on the definition of the word adequate.

Mr. HENRY: Mr. Chairman, briefly on this question of Polish war veterans and the anomalous cases the minister has mentioned, this occurred to me. You could have the facility of administration that you have now just as well if there was in this Act a section enabling a reference, say to the Exchequer Court of Canada, to determine what compassionate circumstances would warrant the waiving of requirements in any individual case for Canadian citizenship, and if that enabling section were put in the Act it would relieve the minister of the onerous task of considering a flood of such applications. It would put the onus on the court and applicants could go into the court directly in this matter. I only put that forward for the consideration of the officials. I think it is worth thinking about.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It opens up a very large question.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dupuis indicates that he has not finished.

Mr. DUPUIS: I forgot that I was not finished.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That also happens in the House of Commons.

Mr. DUPUIS: This could not happen in Montreal because judges there know both French and English, but suppose a judge in Toronto happens to turn down an application on account of the applicant not knowing English and the applicant then says that he knows French. It would be hard for a judge to know whether that man knows French or not. If a man declares in Toronto that he does not know English but knows French who would judge him?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The judge will and he is very good. I carried on a conversation with him in French myself. You will have to select some other place than Toronto, because the judge there understands French very well.

Mr. DUPUIS: I have heard of applications being turned down for not knowing English, but if the person knew French he would be eligible?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He would be eligible.

Mr. FULTON: In most cases there would be an interpreter available.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: In defence of the judge of the county of York, Judge Denton, he went to the summer school at Laval and studied French.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This was Judge Denton I was referring to.

Mr. MICHENER: I have heard him conduct an entire meeting in French.

Mr. MONTEITH: I have a question which I think comes under the registration branch.

Mr. DINSDALE: I have a question on the Polish veterans. Some of these Polish veterans were hospitalized apparently after their arrival. Is there any additional delay period resulting from that?

Mr. FORTIER: No.

Mr. DINSDALE: In the case of a Polish veteran who applied in 1952 for a landing and had his application held in abeyance until such time as he could be cleared medically could his application be dated back?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. You cannot date back any application.

Mr. DINSDALE: What would be the delay in giving him his landing permit?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If someone cannot comply with the medical requirements of the Immigration Act he cannot be landed and until he is landed his time for domicile cannot count.

Mr. DINSDALE: He was medically fit and discharged from hospital for several years, but because he had been hospitalized there was a delay in giving him his landing clearance.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not quite follow you. You mean he has applied for a landing? Or that in 1948 and 1949 he was medically all right but neglected to apply until 1952?

Mr. DINSDALE: He applied in 1952 and there was a delay in clearance since he had been in hospital since 1947.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think one would have to see the exact facts in that case. It would be rather silly to try to deal with it without the specific facts. If you could discuss it with me privately I would be very glad to look into the facts.

Mr. MONTEITH: As I understand it the fee for citizenship goes to the province?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It goes to the court.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if you might explain what is the $10,000 in the estimates mostly for certificates of citizenship. What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Do you not have one?

Mr. MONTEITH: I have a birth certificate.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have been waiting a long time for this opportunity. This miniature citizenship certificate will admit you almost anywhere in the world.

Mr. FULTON: I think the minister should file his with the clerk.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be glad to supply one of these to any member of the committee on rececipt of $1. I am sorry, I am told that it is $2 but I will put the other dollar in myself for any member of the committee who will send me a dollar and two photographs.

Mr. DUPUIS: No influence, please.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Maybe you are right.

Mr. MONTEITH: This revenue is from the sale of those?

Mr. FORTIER: And the fees from the other applications listed at the end of the schedule. There is a fee for the filing of the declaration of intention paid to the department and also the fee for the application under sections 10(2), 10(4), 11(2) or 11(3) of the Act—they are all listed on page 27 of the office consolidation of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 60?

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps Mr. Duggan or the minister can say what is the relationship and coordination between this branch and the Citizenship branch; what is the field covered by each?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think you may say that the Citizenship registration branch has functions which are almost entirely formal and the Citizenship branch functions almost entirely informal, that is to say the Citizenship branch

does not deal with any of the legal aspects of citizenship at all; it is in charge of promotional activity for the encouragement of a sense of citizenship in the community, primarily among the newcomers. There is no real connection except that they both deal to a considerable extent with the same group of people.

Mr. FULTON: Citizenship registration is concerned with the processing of applications and keeping of records only?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there a registry where you can search alphabetically to see who are registered citizens?

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I would be interested to know how many people in Canada hold citizenship certificates?

Mr. DUGGAN: I can give those figures briefly. We go back to what we call the old Naturalization Act which was in effect up until 1914; 296,000 people were naturalized under that Act. Under the 1914 Act which came into effect on January 1, 1915 and remained in effect until December 31, 1946—these figures are approximate—347,422 certificates were granted and these were all to aliens, because at that time you were either a British subject or an alien. There was no such a term as Canadian citizens so far as citizenship was concerned. Under the present Act since the 1st January, 1947 we have granted and issued a total of approximately 176,299, and of that group 93,196 were granted to aliens. Then there are two other forms of certificates such as readmission of former Canadian women who lost their status by marriage, and I think the total was about 5,000. Now, in addition to that we issued to various types of Canadians 77,762 certificates. That makes up the total I gave of 176,299.

Mr. MICHENER: There are only 77,000 Canadians who have availed themselves of the opportunity of having a certificate saying they are Canadian citizens?

Mr. DUGGAN: It is interesting there to note that the great majority of those were former aliens who were naturalized in Canada prior to 1947 and had the right under the new Act to exchange their former certificates for the certificate of Canadian citizenship. The total there is 35,379.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Up until now this bargain has not been taken up much by Canadian people.

Mr. DUGGAN: The total for Canadian born is 15,977.

The CHAIRMAN: May we carry that item?

Mr. MONTEITH: I haven't anything to ask concerning individual items, but I might like to say something about the overall expenditure of the Citizenship branch later.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps we could carry it with that reservation?

Mr. FULTON: Is there discernible over the years a gradual increase in the number of certificates you are issuing to aliens?

Mr. DUGGAN: It became quite discernible early last fall. Particularly in October and November of last year we received each month approximately 6,000 applications. If you take that over a period of a year it would be approximately 72,000 applications. The normal number of applications prior to 1954 was much less than that; it was in the neighbourhood of something like 13 or 14,000. There has been a very marked increase in the number of applications, an almost embarassing increase because of the necessity of keeping up with them.

Mr. FULTON: That was in October of last year. Has that been maintained up until the present?

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And it is on that we base our expectation of an absolute flood in Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet tomorrow at 3.30, and Thursday at 3.30 in this room.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is it thought that we would take the whole of tomorrow on the Citizenship branch or should I have the director of the Indian Affairs branch here as well?

Mr. MICHENER: I think we are pretty well through with the Citizenship branch.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Then I will ask the director of the Indian Affairs branch to be here.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 13

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. E. Bussiere, Director, Citizenship Branch; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Personnel Officer; Mr. H. M. Jones, Director, Miss M. Walton, Administrative Officer, and Mr. R. Davey, Superintendent, Educational Division, all of the Indian Affairs Branch.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55311—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, March 16, 1955.
(14)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Decore, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Garland, Hellyer, Lafontaine, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Pickersgill, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Starr, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. E. Bussiere, Director, Citizenship Branch; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administration Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Personnel Officers; Mr. H. M. Jones, Director, Miss M. Walton, Administrative Officer, and Mr. R. Davey, Superintendent, Educational Division, all of the Indian Affairs Branch.

The Committee considered the 1955-56 Estimates of the Canadian Citizenship Branch.

Item numbered 61 was adopted.

Items numbered 62 to 65 inclusive—Miscellaneous Grants—were adopted.

The 1955-56 Estimates of the Indian Affairs Branch were considered.

The Minister and his officials supplied information regarding the items under study.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 11.00 o'clock a.m., Thursday, March 17.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

55311—1½

PROCEEDINGS

March 16, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. We are on item 61, "Citizenship Branch," page 12 of the estimates.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, would you permit me to say a word? When I read the Montreal *Gazette* this morning and saw that for the first time something I had said in this committee was actually reported in the newspapers my feeling of vanity was mixed with vexation of spirit because I was not quite sure, in view of the fact that what I had been talking about was a provincial matter, that I had not gone a bit far in what I said I would like to make it clear to the committee that I was not reflecting in any way on the government of Quebec or upon the courts of Quebec, nor was I reflecting in any way upon the government of Ontario or upon the courts of Ontario. It is true I said they were doing this work inadequately and I stand by that, and I am sure they would agree with me, but I was not seeking to impute any kind of blame and I would not want anyone to think I was. We cannot reasonably expect them to perform what is really a federal service when the work assumes such proportions, and that is why the federal government is to take it over directly in Toronto and Montreal.

I just wanted to have the record quite clear that I was not suggesting that anybody's conduct had been disgraceful. It is just the situation, and perhaps "disgraceful" is too strong a word. But the situation is not worthy of this country.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you wish to have any of your staff, or your deputy minister, make any statement on the Citizenship branch?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps, if the committee would like it, we could ask Mr. Bussiere to say very briefly what his branch does, because his is perhaps the most amorphous of all the branches of the department. The Citizenship registration branch had a very clear function to perform, but Mr. Bussiere's function is merely the spreading of light and it is sometimes not too easy to measure the length of the beam.

Mr. E. BUSSIERE (*Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch*): I do not think I have much to add to what the minister said the other day about the duties of the branch. We are engaged primarily in trying to develop a sense of responsibility and citizenship and I would say that 90 per cent of our work has been done in connection with the integration of newcomers into the Canadian community. This is done in three ways. We have divided our functions into three different divisions and we have liaison staff both at headquarters and in various regions whose duties are to keep in touch with national and local voluntary organizations in order to help them plan citizenship programs.

We also have a staff here in Ottawa to prepare program materials and information to be disseminated to the various voluntary organizations engaged in this work at the local level, and in order to enlighten our own actions we have initiated research into the problem of the attitudes of newcomers and the problem of their adjustment.

That is briefly what we are attempting to do.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do you enter into any agreement with local educational authorities for language classes for new migrants?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Yes, we give 50 per cent of the cost for language and citizenship classes conducted by the provinces, plus free distribution of all text-books for these classes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): You do not enter into any agreement with local educational authorities?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have agreements with all the provinces, I understand, except one, and I would not like it to be thought that in that province nothing has been done, because I believe that in the one province where we have not got an agreement there is an arrangement whereby we provide text-books in the classes which are given in the city of Montreal.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What I had in mind was this: would the arrangements which the provincial authorities have, for example, in British Columbia result in classes in Vancouver and Victoria?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mainly in Vancouver because most of the immigrants are there, but this does not mean that there are no classes being held in other centres.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I recall that two or three years ago there was a call which went out for volunteers in my constituency. They were asking for people who happened to be able to teach English to new immigrants. The Parent-Teachers Association sent out this call, and we got quite a lot of volunteers. One of our troubles was that we had no central place to which we could ask people to come. We had no funds for renting school properties or anything of that sort and that is why I am wondering whether it would be possible for the Immigration people to deal directly with the local authorities, who after all are the supreme body in British Columbia with regard to finance.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, it is very curious; that was pointed out to me in connection with a little homework I was doing on the Indian Affairs Estimates—the fact that in British Columbia which I suppose gives more financial support to education than any province except Newfoundland, there seems to be a maximum amount of autonomy vested in the local school authorities. We have felt for a variety of reasons that the best way to do this was simply to offer to make an agreement with the provincial government. I have a copy of one here which I will pass around if anyone would like to inspect it. An agreement is made with the government of the province, between the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on our part and usually the Minister of Education in the province on the other, whereby we pay half of the teaching costs of this course and under which we provide the text-books.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does the minister think that the local authority is aware of this situation?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL. I think that in most places where there are considerable problems, they are aware of it. We have given a good deal of publicity to this in our advertisements. The expenditures are rather interesting for the fiscal year 1953-54: Newfoundland, $295.50; Nova Scotia, $1,993.31; Prince Edward Island, $344.38; New Brunswick, $428.70; Ontario, $93,828.01; Manitoba, $10,341.00; Saskatchewan, $935.25; Alberta, $3,730.63; British Columbia, $5,866.98; Northwest Territories, $500.00. Total, $118,263.76.

Mr. HELLYER: Would you give me some idea of what is being done in the city of Toronto?

Mr. LAVAL FORTIER (*Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*): We work through the provincial government, and the provincial government of Ontario has a branch called Community Program. Courses are organized here and there and the liaison officers of the Citizenship branch co-operate with the provincial authorities. My understanding, from the Deputy Minister of

Education, is that Ontario is providing money for these classes. For every dollar they spend for the teaching in these citizenship classes, they bill us for 50 cents.

Mr. HELLYER: Do we have a record of what they do in the various municipalities?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Yes, they keep a record of the expenditures every year, but I do not have it here.

Mr. HELLYER: Do you know offhand what courses there are?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps we could bring it for the next meeting, because I think we had better have the actual information.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could you obtain that for British Columbia also?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would the members like to have the last available accounts for all the provinces?

Mr. LAFONTAINE: All accounts.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Hellyer wants to see what they are doing locally.

Mr. HELLYER: Where they are, and what we are getting for our money.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that that is a good point, but I regret to say that the information is not available at our fingertips.

Mr. STARR: I should like to commend the minister on the excellent booklets that he and his department are publishing for the information of new Canadians and for the purpose of integrating them into the Canadian way of life. But, as you know, they are published only in English and French, and I am wondering whether the minister and his department have considered putting out similar information in other languages, so that it would be available to those people who arrive in this country and wish to prepare themselves for citizenship, but who cannot as yet read literature in English or French.

Mr. FORTIER: The Handbook for Newcomer, as I mentioned yesterday, is published in five languages. The series about "Our Government", "Our History", and "Our Land" etc. is in English and French. In addition—and I wish to correct the statement I made yesterday—although the "Steps to Citizenship" is distributed only in English and French, stencil copies of the qualifications required for Canadian citizenship are distributed in several languages. This is in Ukrainian, Polish, Italian, German, and so on.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To come back to Mr. Starr's question, the object of most of these booklets is to assist in learning the language as well as about the country and they are written in as simple language as possible. I am told—and Mr. Bussiere will correct me if I am wrong—that some of them begin with a very limited vocabulary, almost basic English, and introduce more difficult words as they go on, because part of their purpose is to assist people in learning English or French. After all, that is one of the qualifications newcomers need in order to become Canadian citizens. I think that there would be a good deal of criticism if we published any large range of publications in any other language than the official languages of the country.

Mr. STARR: What I had in mind was that it has been brought out in the House that the communistic press in various languages tried to infiltrate their ideology into the minds of these people. I doubt whether the meetings held by the Citizenship branch at various points in order to offset this propaganda is sufficient. Probably the Citizenship branch should launch a program of the same type of information in the various ethnic presses.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In regard to that point, Mr. Starr, as Mr. Hellyer knows, I have been giving a good deal of consideration to this problem which is a very great one, not only in Oshawa but in the whole Toronto area. Most of

these papers are published in Toronto. When I was young they were mostly published in Winnipeg. There are some published in Montreal as well. My predecessor expanded the amount of paid publicity through these papers, and I think that we were very pleased with the results that we got from that rather small expenditure of money. I am quite seriously considering recommending to my colleague, the Minister of Finance—I see Mr. Thatcher prick up his ears at once—that we spend a little more than the amounts in the regular estimates and that I put something in the supplementary estimates, if I can see that good use could be made of it, and I think I can. We do not want to spend this money unless it is going to be of real value. I have been giving much consideration to it in the spare moments that I have had. When I get through with this committee and can have a few minutes to give some attention to the administration of the department, I am going to follow that up.

Mr. MONTEITH: I presume that these textbooks are translated from another language into English. I was wondering how many languages they were translated from.

Mr. BUSSIERE: The textbooks that we distribute are only for the classes on language and citizenship.

Mr. MONTEITH: Do you mean that they are all in English?

Mr. BUSSIERE: They are all in English for English classes, and in French for French classes. Besides that, as I mentioned, we distribute through voluntary organizations, the Department of Education or various channels, these leaflets in various languages—about a dozen languages—to give them information on the steps they should take to become Canadian citizens. It is the kind of information which is on the mimeograph which we distribute in several languages. These booklets that you have are only for the purpose of the language and citizenship classes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand that the method of instruction is the same as for teaching children at school. It is not the same as the way in which Mr. Monteith and I learned French. They begin like young children do, learning to read out of a primer and then working on from that. Some work up very fast, and some begin three-quarters of the way through the course.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if the department has any knowledge of schools in various parts of the country. I am thinking of one in western Ontario that is presumed to be taught in a native language. In other words, it is a little corps of new immigrants settling down in one community and having its own school, teacher, and so on, in its own language.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, I would not say that I had not heard about things like that, Mr. Monteith, but you know the profound respect I have exhibited at all times for the jurisdiction of provincial authorities over education. I understand that in the province of Ontario it is part of the law that you must attend a school that is approved by the provincial authorities. I presume that the provincial government sees that all children in this province obey the law that it lays down. I would not think that was any part of my business. What I may know as gossip is one thing, but that would not be any part of my official business.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do these schools have a general curriculum, or are they just language schools?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I really do not know. I have no knowledge except hearsay.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): We have many language schools of that type in British Columbia, but they are confined to teaching the children of immigrants their parents' language. But even there the provincial authorities inspect those schools to see that nothing else is slipped in along with the language.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would assume that that would happen everywhere but, as I say, that would be under provincial jurisdiction. I think that we would have to take some account of it if immigrants came here and persistently kept their children out of school. We might have to help the provincial authorities. I think that they would come into the class of persons in our Act who are unsuitable having regard to the economic, social, industrial, educational and other conditions in Canada.

Mr. MONTEITH: The department assumes that all these schools in the various provinces to which they contribute as part of the cost of education—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, we do not contribute to the education of children. These are night classes for adults. We assume that the provinces want these newcomers and that they are just as ready to take into the provincial system the children of immigrants as they are any other children. The education of children of newcomers is no business of ours at all. We are concerned with adults, to help them qualify for citizenship.

Mr. STARR: I think it would be found that these schools are not conducted during the day. Classes are conducted in public schools or separate schools approved by the department. They are evening classes for maybe one or two hours.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know anything about the facts. I have enough responsibilities without intervening in the responsibilities of the provincial government.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Bussiere mentioned that the greater percentage of the work of the department has to do with the selling of citizenship to newcomers to Canada. What work might the department do other than that?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We have found out that if we want to integrate the newcomer to the Canadian community, we have to convince the Canadians that they should be accepted. This means that we also have to work very closely with various voluntary organizations engaged in the broader field of citizenship. One aspect that we consider all the time is the acceptance of the newcomers. We suggest that they invite them to their clubs and their discussion groups and so on.

Mr. MONTEITH: How do you go about letting that information be known?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We attend most of the annual meetings of the national associations. We are very often called in as advisers to sit with their boards in the planning of citizenship programs. We go along on request most of the time and we have, in the course of the years, developed close relationships with all these groups. They know us, and they know that we have regional offices in the various regions. They know that we can call on the national offices here in Ottawa, and it is done either by correspondence or by visits, and so on.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: For instance, the work done by the Rotary clubs is really splendid. They hold meetings from time to time to which they bring newcomers. They bring children to Ottawa from all over the country. Of course, the children are not all immigrants. We do not feel that, because someone's parents were born in Canada, he ought to be ignored by the department, but our primary emphasis is on the newcomers.

Mr. MONTEITH: I can understand that.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask whether the minister would explain the expenditure of $35,000, as shown on page 144, for films, displays and advertising.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I have some information on that. Most of this was to provide for a film, and the purpose of this particular film was to portray discussion techniques and how meetings are carried on, and that sort of thing,

in democratic communities. That was to be shown to newcomers, to assist them in becoming citizens and helping to work our institutions.

Mr. THATCHER: Did you have the National Film Board do this for you?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: What advertising would you have?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have the $15,000, which I mentioned in reply to Mr. Starr's question. The amount for the film was $20,000. The paid advertising, which is mainly in the foreign-language press, was $15,000. That is the amount which I think is too small. The film is not completed. We are not going to be able to spend all the money this year, and we will have to spend some of it next year. When the film is completed I will arrange to have it screened in one of these National Film Board programs downstairs, if the committee think that it would be sufficiently interesting. I would be very glad to have any criticisms of it.

Mr. DINSDALE: How would this film be distributed?

Mr. BUSSIERE: It would be distributed through the normal channels of the National Film Board.

Mr. DINSDALE: To local film councils, and so forth?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We would call the attention of the various voluntary groups to the fact that this film is available and that it could be borrowed from the film library of the National Film Board. We might buy a few copies to put in our own offices in the various regions, if the minister agreed, to place them at the disposal of the various groups, but we do not plan to spend a great deal of money. It would be only a few dollars to buy a copy of the film.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I happen to be, in another capacity, the minister responsible for the National Film Board. It is not as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, but it is as a Privy Councillor, and I do try to have them work closely with one another, as Mr. Harris also did.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could the minister tell us if the department has any policy in the face of the tendency of new immigrants to go to communities in which there are a majority of their own ethnic group? For instance, I do not know what the minister would think, but I think that has been one of our troubles. Perhaps it is perfectly natural, and we could do the same thing ourselves. When we go to a community, we go to one of the same ethnic group and speaking the same language.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, when I was a schoolboy living in northern Manitoba, where we had many immigrants, we used to talk a good deal about what a dreadful thing it was that these people congregated together in communities and how much longer it would take them, on that account, to become integrated in the country. I have completely changed my views about that. If the Selkirk by-election did no other good, it gave me a chance to go back for ten days to the place where I was brought up and see what had happened. The only bad evolution that I could see was that they now elected a C.C.F.er. In every other respect, the progress is really quite remarkable. I taught school in a Ukrainian district, where the people had little or no contact with English-speaking people, in 1925, before there were many motorcars and before there were roads communicating with the rest of the district. It was a very isolated place indeed. I was there last November, and I saw the same little faces that I had taught. It was just 30 years later. They were the children of my pupils and they were just ordinary, normal Canadians. I have come to the conclusion that if people in their early days in the country have neighbours with whom they feel at home, where there are enough of the group and where they are not isolated units, it probably makes it easier for them to integrate naturally and normally without too much strain. Where you have isolated

individuals, if they are very strong individualist types like some of the Scottish immigrants of that country, it may not do them any harm. But isolation is hard on most people. Another way in which I could put it is this: I shall never forget that after I had been at Oxford for about a month someone sent me a copy of the *Winnipeg Free Press,* and what a relief it was to me to get a newspaper that knew how to arrange the news so that one could find out what was happening in the world. Ever since then I have been very sympathetic with people who want their own kind of things and people around them.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am very sympathetic with them also, but I was wondering what the department's attitude was.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps I have given some ridiculous illustrations, but I have tried to give the impression that I do not think it is a bad thing for these people to settle in groups, if they do not get ingrown.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): We have some groups quite badly ingrown.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I know that is quite true.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if we could have a little explanation. I notice that there is an item, "Educational and Informational Publications, $46,350", and there is another, "Language Texts for Citizenship Classes, $100,000", and another, "To provide additional facilities for citizenship instruction, $75,560". They all tie in together in some way, but what is the extra item of $75,560? It is up $35,000 from last year.

Mr. FORTIER: There is a decrease from $140,000 to $100,000, and then there is an increase in the facilities from $40,000 to $75,000. Is that the one?

Mr. MONTEITH: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: One is down by $40,000, and the other is up by $35,000.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would that be just switching from one item to another?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Part of the reason for the increase is that four new grants have been transferred from the Department of Finance to our own department. The Boy Scouts, $15,000, the Girl Guides, $12,000, and two other groups, making a total of $41,000.

Mr. MONTEITH: No. That is a separate item under miscellaneous grants. That is not the item. This is the third last item under the Citizenship branch.

Mr. BUSSIERE: There is an increase there of $13,000 for grants to voluntary organizations and an increase of $22,560 for research.

Mr. MONTEITH: What type of research?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Research on Indians in British Columbia, which amounted to $20,000. This is a continuation of a project which was begun last year. Then we have organized recently a research division in our own branch which we want to get working. One of the projects listed there is research work on attitudes of Canadians towards immigrants. Another is on adjustment of immigrants and the problems which they face in the process of their adjustment, in order to help us to understand them better and to orient our own work. Another project is on the role of ethnic societies as a tool for integration. We deal with that regularly. We refer immigrants to their own societies, where they speak their own language. We do not know to what extent these organizations help or slow down the progress of integration. Then we have an amount of $2,500 for small grants to advanced students in the field of social sciences, to help them to complete studies on subjects of interest to the branch and problems related to immigrants or ethnic groups.

Mr. MONTEITH: What expense would be involved in the research, other than salaries?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Most of these are to be conducted outside, because a government official might be suspect and might not get the right answers.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is it a Gallup Poll?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is done mostly by scholars in universities. It is not done at all by our staff. As a matter of fact, I do not think I would be very happy at presiding over a government department where civil servants did research of this kind. I think that Mr. Bussiere has put his finger on something that the opposition would have every reason to criticize. They would think that we were trying to organize some kind of propaganda bureau.

Mr. MONTEITH: You do not do that in any of the departments?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would not think of it. It is a shocking suggestion.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this research project a new venture?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We have made a small beginning this year. We have hired an expert on problems of attitudes, who has built up a questionnaire, and all we have done through our staff has been to test this questionnaire in one area in order to see how the instrument would work. Now we are calling on him again to validate the questionnaire so that the instrument can be used by outside agencies. You would not find, even in our own universities, people capable of doing everything in research. This is the specialized type of job for which you have to call an expert.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the amount involved in this particular research?

Mr. BUSSIERE: On the attitudes of Canadians towards immigrants it amounts to $6,750; on the adjustment of immigrants and beginning to prepare all the other instruments to work, it is $2,000; and on the ethnic organizations it is $3,400.

Mr. MONTEITH: I was wondering about the increase in the number of employees in this department from 39 to 46 this year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps Mr. Abbott could deal with that.

Mr. J. K. ABBOTT *(Chief, Personnel Division, Department of Citizenship and Immigration)*: There are seven new positions. I should perhaps explain that in addition there were a few changes in classification for existing positions. The new positions are as follows. The carillonneur who was formerly employed in the Department of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was felt that he was more of a citizen than a public work.

Mr. ABBOTT: An Administration Officer GR 5 for the liaison division at Toronto. An Administrative Officer GR 3 and an Administrative Officer GR 2 for the Programmes and Materials division at Ottawa. In addition there are three minor clerical or stenographic positions at Ottawa. A Clerk GR 3, a Clerk GR 1 and a stenographer GR 2A.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, if I had my way, this is a branch for which I would be asking more money next year.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you get any revenue?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not from this one. The Citizenship Registration branch will ask for more staff at Toronto and Montreal. We will get revenue to pay for it and more than enough to pay for it. But we do not get any revenue from this branch.

Mr. THATCHER: Why do you think you will have to increase your staff?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have opened a liaison office in Hamilton recently. There was a sort of office there for some time, but we have appointed a man there. We are going to have one in Toronto, where we have always had one, but Hamilton is a new office. There is nobody east of Montreal engaged in this work. There is no one in Saskatchewan. The post in Alberta is now vacant because the incumbent resigned to take a better paid job. I think that we ought to have two or three more of these liaison officers. I know

that Mr. Bussiere is not going to like my saying this, but personally I would like to spend more money on the people in the field who are actually dealing with newcomers, and perhaps a little less on research. Mr. Dinsdale may not approve of that either, because he is a little closer to the academic grove than I am. I do think that this liaison work is worth doing. If it is worth doing, it is worth doing properly. I also think that we are going to have to pay higher salaries. The salaries were started on too low a scale. There has been for too long in this country an impression that academics come cheap. I spent eight years as an academic, and I do not think that they ought to be treated that way.

Mr. MONTEITH: What are the "Professional and Special Services"? I notice that there is an increase of $3,700, from $4,500 to $8,200.

Mr. BUSSIERE: This allotment provides for the payment of readers of the foreign-language press. We are going to add a part-time reader there to read the Dutch papers. Then the biggest amount of the increase is due to the fact that we want to have a part-time consulant in Montreal. As you know, we have only one office to cover the whole province. As the minister has just pointed out, we feel it essential to give services to strengthen the positions in our regional offices. This is a beginning, to have a part-time expert in the group work program, planning and so on, to work with our own officer there. $3,000 is provided for that.

Mr. MICHENER: In regard to the reading of the foreign-language press, does that result in some report?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, as a matter of fact some of the information is simply for the internal consumption of the department. It is quite obvious that there are things in these papers that are very useful to the Immigration branch and the Citizenship branch to know about. We make much of the other material available to foreign-language papers. It is translated and given to voluntary agencies, so that there is some exchange of this information.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it to cover all the foreign-language papers in Canada?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Including those of which we do not approve.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not a security measure?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is not primarily a security measure.

Mr. MICHENER: It is to obtain information, some of which may be useful for security purposes and some for other purposes. It is considered a good thing to do?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is considered a good thing to do.

Mr. MICHENER: That is for the internal consumption of the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not exclusively.

Mr. BUSSIERE: Every two weeks we publish a press review of the foreign-language press in order to inform the various voluntary organizations of the programs of the various ethnic groups in Canada. This is the kind of information which helps them to a better understanding of what the ethnic groups think of various Canadian problems and to follow the trends in the changes in their attitudes about Canadian problems.

Mr. STARR: Is this something new?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It has been going on for quite a long while, and I am told that quite a lot of use is made of it.

Mr. STARR: To whom do you distribute these press reviews?

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mainly to ethnic groups, various voluntary organizations at the community level, and to any individual interest in this problem.

The list is rather limited, it is about 400, and it is not costly. It is only a mimeographed publication.

Mr. STARR: I was not aware that this had been publicized.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would you like to be put on the mailing list?

Mr. STARR: Yes, I would. There must be a few people who are aware that it is available.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact I am constitutionally rather allergic to creating long mailing lists to send publications to people who like myself, I am bound to confess, put an awful lot of stuff into the wastepaper basket, and I try to keep mailing lists limited to those who say they are interested.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are there any English or French newspapers interested in reprinting these items?

Mr. BUSSIERE: I could not say. But what we are attempting to do is this—I refer members to the Ottawa Citizen newspaper, which I know very well,—where very frequently they report in a special column the views of the French press. That is what we are trying to do for the other papers.

Mr. DINSDALE: Do you send a copy to every ethnic paper you know of?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: To all those who are likely to make use of it. There are a certain number of the ethnic papers which are not very friendly toward our department.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you supply this to other weekly and daily newspapers in Canada?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We would if they asked for it.

Mr. THATCHER: Perhaps they do not know such a think exists.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Then perhaps their correspondents who are here will tell them.

Mr. BUSSIERE: One of the difficulties is that we cannot follow the "actuality" of events as they occur. Some of these papers are only monthly publications and by the time these items appear, the news is five or six weeks old. For this reason it lacks interest for the daily papers.

Mr. MICHENER: This copy which I have appears to be a discussion on the press, but I take it the usual thing is for the review to contain quotations from the press, not a discussion.

Mr. BUSSIERE: Most of the time.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there a certain amount of commentary?

Mr. BUSSIERE: We avoid it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I notice that in a good many cases we print summaries rather than actual quotations.

Mr. MICHENER: It sets out to be a factual account of what has been said, and not comments from the department.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is true.

Mr. STARR: In some of the articles which you have put out already, you have outlined the history of some of the ethnic groups which are at present in Canada.

Mr. BUSSIERE: We have published a series on ethnic groups in this review.

Mr. HELLYER: I notice here an item relating to the salary of the carilloneur. Do you feel it is more appropriate there than under the building construction branch?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think this all arose one day last year when one of the members of parliament wanted something played on the carillon. I was at that time Secretary of State, and it always seems to be assumed that any function of government which is not obviously someone else's

responsibility must be the responsibility of the Secretary of State. This member came to me and asked whether I would arrange to have a particular piece of music played at a particular time. I said. "I am not musical." He said, "On the carillon." I said, "I have nothing to do with the carillon." He asked me whether I would suggest a department which might be responsible for it and I told him, "I haven't the faintest idea. I suppose it is the Speaker." However the Speaker disclaimed all knowledge of it and said that the Peace Tower did not belong to either the House of Commons or the Senate. It was neutral. And then I had a bright idea and said, "I bet it is the Department of Public Works." And when Mr. Winters found out that it was he promptly got it foisted on the Department of Citizenship. I must say, however, that my administration of the carillon has been purely passive up to now.

Mr. HELLYER: I do hope the minister will make the best possible use of this gentleman in the field of citizenship.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Oh, yes.

Mr. HELLYER: Referring again to this question of clerks grade I. I asked the minister a couple of weeks ago if he could give me any information about them. Has an answer been prepared on that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I thought we were going to return to that when this has been disposed of, but the information can be given to you now if you wish. Mr. Abbott says he has it available and he is here. I gather, Mr. Hellyer, you thought they were probably being underpaid.

Mr. HELLYER: I thought they were being underpaid if they were competent.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That they should either have their pay increased or be sacked? Mr. Abbott tells me he must search in his bag a little longer, so if there is another question in the meantime we might hear it.

Mr. MICHENER: Referring to these grants. Are they being given to voluntary organizations? I would like to have a list of the organizations if it is not too lengthy and also to know what their attitude is—whether they are satisfied or whether they feel they could use more money.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will give you one guess!

Mr. MICHENER: Do you press money on them for the purpose of getting any jobs done?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do not. I think you can fairly say that we have not pressed money on anybody. Possibly once or twice we have suggested one of these research projects, but it is generally some interested person who comes along and suggests it to us. Last year the grant to the Canadian Association was $8,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Better than when I was a director on it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is going to be a lot better this year because we have increased it to $14,500, but this is partly because of one or two special tasks which they have been asked to do. If anybody wishes me to go into technicalities about that afterwards we are prepared to explain them. I will read the figures.

Société Canadienne d'Éducation des Adultes, $2,000; The Canadian Citizenship Council, $10,000; The Y.W.C.A. (for a specific project), $3,500; The Canadian Branch of the World Assembly of Youths, $1,000; Laquemac Camp, $1,000; and smaller projects in British Columbia and Alberta—the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews and the University of Alberta Extension Department, $2,000; and a project being organized in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, $2,000; The Ontario Community Program in Ontario, $2,000; The Atlantic provinces, Mount Allison and St. Joseph's universities, $2,000; making a total with the $14,500 for the Canadian Association of Adult Education of $40,000.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the grants which we actually recommended. And then when we went to the Treasury Board, Mr. Harris very generously transferred to this department from the Department of Finance grants which had previously been going through that department: to the Boy Scouts, $15,000; to the Girl Guides, $12,000; to the Boys' clubs, of Canada, $10,000; to the Canadian Writers' Foundation, $4,000. They are listed as miscellaneous grants.

Mr. MICHENER: The Citizenship grants then are not the same as the grants under the Immigration branch? You make some grants under Immigration to responsible agencies?

Mr. FORTIER: Not the same at all.

Mr. MICHENER: Your department is becoming a cultural catch-all.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think I had better just take that lying down.

Mr. DINSDALE: This grant to the Canadian Citizenship Council—is that in return for the performance of any specific function?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Bussiere might tell us.

Mr. BUSSIERE: Apart from the grants which have been transferred from the Department of Finance to our department the general policy is to give a grant on the basis of projects submitted in advance. All the organizations which have requested grants previously are invited to get in touch with us in the summer or in the fall to help us plan the estimates and they then submit all the projects which they have in mind for the coming year, and it is on this basis we prepare the estimates. Then at the end of the fiscal year they are supposed to submit a detailed statement of the activities which they have carried out in conformity with the plans which they submitted in advance together with a statement of the expenditure incurred. It is on this information that we submit a request for a grant to the Treasury Board.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In other words it is not for the general purposes of the organization that these grants are made, but for particular projects, except in the case of these miscellaneous grants.

Mr. DINSDALE: Has the grant to the Citizenship Council increased or decreased over recent years?

Mr. BUSSIERE: This year they have submitted a request for less than they did last year.

Mr. DINSDALE: Some of the functions being carried out by the Citizenship branch seem to be with regard to activities formerly handled by the council. The council was engaged in work in this liaison field quite early on. I know that out west they did a very good job in organizing local voluntary groups to deal with the early influx of immigrants.

Mr. BUSSIERE: I think there is room for a lot of organizations in this field, and all of them have requested our support this present year and last year for the preparation of supplementary reading material for language classes which they distribute on request to departments of education or to voluntary organizations. The whole of these grants are being given on that basis.

Mr. HELLYER: How was this figure for $400 postage arrived at?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apparently we spent $116 up until October 31, but they seem to think a little more will be required because the Guild of Carilloneurs is going to meet here.

Mr. HELLYER: How does that affect the postage?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was wondering that myself. I beg your pardon, I was reading the explanation of the sundries item.

Mr. BUSSIERE: I think that item is based on last year's expenditure, taking into account the fact that new offices are being opened, and also the increase in the number of requests for some of our publications. These are the new requests which have been stimulated by our advertisements.

Mr. HELLYER: But you do not pay Canadian postage.

Mr. BUSSIERE: Yes, but very often we refer these requests to our regional offices where they have to pay.

Mr. HELLYER: Do not your regional offices have meters?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is only one officer and a stenographer in these regional offices as a rule.

Mr. HELLYER: And they use regular stamps?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. HELLYER: I see.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Up to the 31st of October we had spent during the present fiscal year $252, so it looks like a realistic estimate.

Mr. HELLYER: Has the minister any idea what it would cost for postage—the fees which would be incurred by all the departments—if you had to pay for all the postage?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Maybe the Post Office has that figure, but I do not think we have. I have some statistics of the amount of mail sent out from our department and the amount received, and I suppose it would be possible to study this information and form a fairly shrewd guess as to what it would be. We keep these records to see whether the volume of work is increasing or decreasing. It is a useful check and I always find it very interesting.

Mr. MONTEITH: I just want to make a few more general remarks. I think the same situation applies under Citizenship to a certain degree as existed under the Immigration branch. Adding together the estimates for the year 1952-53 of the Citizenship branch we come to a figure of $586,000, roughly, and the lapsed vote, if you care to call it so, was some $59,000. In other words it is over 10 per cent. In 1953-54 on total estimates of $818,000, the surplus is $163,190, almost 20 per cent. Now that does not exist. That situation does not exist in the year 1954-55 to the same degree. Now, using the estimated expenditure for the year 1954-55 as it appears in the 1955-56 estimates, we show only a surplus of 1·5 per cent. In looking over and comparing these estimated expenditures as they appear in the year's estimates it seems that they are invariably somewhat larger than the actual expenditures published in the Public Accounts. I do not wish to do other than comment to the effect that apparently in the years 1952-53 and 1953-54 there was certainly more than sufficient cushion in the estimating and I hope that the estimates in the present year are not drawn up on a similar basis so that it will turn out that there is a considerable surplus at the end of the year.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: So do I.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Now we can deal with Mr. Hellyer's point.

Mr. ABBOTT: There are twelve persons occupying positions in the administrative branch classified as clerical grade II-A, and clerical grade I, ten are in grade II-A and two in grade I. Perhaps I should give the committee the descriptive titles for their positions which indicate the type of work they are doing. There are three junior file clerks, three stationery stores assistants, four attendance clerks, one junior clerk in the purchasing division, one assistant microfilm processor, and one junior clerk who is a clerk typist.

Mr. HELLYER: How old are these people?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have their dates of birth here but I have not worked out the ages. However, I think I can say that the majority of them are quite young. For example, one of the clerks grade I has been with us for approximately a year, and the other for about five or six months.

Mr. HELLYER: Are they young people fresh out of school?

Mr. ABBOTT: Just beginners. One is a clerk typist who recently joined the service.

The CHAIRMAN: We have dealt with the miscellaneous grants. That is carried. Now we are on Indian Affairs. The first item is that headed "Administration," item 70.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
	INDIAN AFFAIRS BRANCH					
70	Administration.....	150	444,602	427,964	16,638	

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would you like me to introduce Colonel Jones now? Major Davey and Miss Walton are also here to assist Colonel Jones if required.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you wish to make any statement yourself on this branch, Mr. Minister, or will Colonel Jones make one?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think I should take the time of the committee by making any extended statement. I think everybody is familiar with the work of the Indian Affairs branch. Far and away the most important part of its work, in my opinion, is the educational work of the branch and I just want to say here to the committee what I say every time I get a chance to say it, that the purpose which Mr. Harris had in introducing the overhaul of the Act and giving a new emphasis to the administrtation was to move along as fast as it was possible to do, with fairness to the Indians and in the measure that they themselves are willing, to make the Indians into Canadian citizens like the rest of us. That is our objective. I do not want to be misunderstood by seeming to suggest that we desire to take away any of their rights, or interfere with anything which they now possess until they themselves want to change their status, but I hope the time will come very rapidly when they will wish to be enfranchised and look after themselves completely like other Canadians. I think that is the real hope of the future, and the principal way of accomplishing that is through education. This education should take place, as far as possible, with other Canadians and not in separate institutions for Indians only. In that regard we look forward to making agreements wherever we can with local educational authorities under which we pay for the education of Indians in the ordinary schools instead of maintaining schools for Indians only. Such agreements, of course, are not possible in the remote parts of the country.

Mr. THATCHER: I was wondering why the government finds itself obliged to maintain a different set-up for Indians and Eskimos. It seems to me that if both these two groups were to come under one department a great deal of saving would be effected and duplication of effort avoided.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In this field I am a most unlettered person. To the best of my knowledge I have never even seen an Eskimo. Their status is quite different from that of the Indians. The Eskimos have no treaty rights. They are Canadian citizens like the rest of us. They do not live on reserves, and I hope they never will, and I also hope we will never apply to the Eskimos the regime which over the years has been applied to the Indians.

Mr. THATCHER: You are working to get the Indians to the same status as the Eskimos?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is quite right, if it is not misunderstood outside this room. Perhaps I should tell the committee that, as superintendent general of Indian Affairs I made an agreement with Mr. Gordon Robertson in his capacity as commissioner for the Northwest Territories and he has taken over the provision of all schools in the Northwest Territories for all kinds of children. In other words, the Indian children in the Northwest Territories are to be educated in the common schools of the territories. This occasioned some confusion. Mr. Lesage as minister made a statement which was misinterpreted. He made a statement in French which was reported in English, in all good faith I am perfectly sure, by a newspaper man who perhaps did not understand the French language very perfectly and the report suggested that the Indian Affairs branch had been transferred to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and there was quite a hullabaloo for two or three days afterwards in the newspapers.

Mr. THATCHER: I suppose that in the far north there are both Eskimo and Indian children?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They would all go to one school. The Northwest Territories Council, of which Mr. Gordon Robertson is the head, is providing one set of schools in the northwest territories for all the children there, Indian, Eskimo and white children, and they will all go to the same schools. I cannot divest myself of the responsibility to see that the Indian children are educated, or for the general lines of their education, but all the facilities are being provided by the council and we believe that this arrangement will not only be economical but that it will prove a much better system of education than we had previously.

Mr. THATCHER: That is a recent arrangement?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was made just this year.

Mr. THATCHER: I think it is a good scheme.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact we have in Ontario a considerable number of agreements with local school boards to take Indians in schools which are adjacent to reserves. We have closed all our schools on the Indian reserve in Sarnia—they no longer exist—and there are quite a number of places across the country where the same thing is being done. It is impossible to "push" this process. You can only act when everybody is ready to act.

Mr. THATCHER: Are you suggesting, Mr. Minister, that the problems of the Eskimos and the problems of the Indians are different, and that there therefore cannot be some more comprehensive administrative set-up?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Apart from the question of education we do not have any of the problems in the case of the Eskimos that we have in the case of the Indians. All these obligations which grow out of the treaties and out of the trusts, the difficulties which have existed in Indian administration ever since the office of superintendent general was established in 1755—just two hundred years ago, I think it was; it is the most ancient office in Canada—do not exist for Eskimos.

Mr. THATCHER: Why do you have all these departments under Northern Affairs, for Eskimos? Why could not the Indian Affairs branch look after 10,000 Eskimos?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We would rather let the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources do more and more for our Indians.

Mr. THATCHER: It seems to me that if you had one department to look after both these groups you would effect considerable economies.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Whenever there is duplication and we can get rid of it, we shall, but I think that if these two functions are to be combined the proper place to combine them is under the Department of Northern Affairs which is responsible for the Northwest Territories, not under the Indian Affairs branch.

Mr. THATCHER: If we are to combine them it does not much matter where.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It matters a great deal to me, Mr. Thatcher. I would rather let Mr. Lesage do it.

The CHAIRMAN: It would then come under local control?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Have you met with much opposition on the part of local authorities to the admission of Indian children into the schools?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We approach them very gently, and if they say, "No", we do not try to press the point.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I remember some years ago when I was a member of the British Columbia legislature I was approached by an Indian in my constituency about one of his children whom he wished to send to the local high school. This man was a veteran of the first world war and therefore entitled to perhaps more than ordinary consideration. I knew the inspector of schools, but I had quite a lot of difficulty in persuading the school board to accept this one child into the high school. Since that time they have opened the schools to all Indian children. I was wondering if there has been improvement generally?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We do not have much difficulty. I have heard it was suggested in one or two places that parents of non-Indian children were afraid that their children might catch tuberculosis, but very few of the Indians who live in places where there are ordinary schools would have tuberculosis anyway.

Mr. THATCHER: I think the tuberculosis rate is somewhat higher, in fact.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We would not send a child with active tuberculosis to school.

Mr. MICHENER: There is another general question of the same character which I would like to ask. It relates to the division of health and education services to the Indians, as between this department and the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have nothing to do with health.

Mr. MICHENER: That is even more extraordinary because I think the education and the health of people fit closely together.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This was the policy decided on at the time the Department of Health and Welfare was established.

Mr. MICHENER: When was that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In 1944.

Mr. MICHENER: What has been the experience in connection with this division of services? Has it worked out satisfactorily or not?

Mr. H. M. JONES (*Director, Indian Affairs Branch*): I think it was a useful change myself—in spite of the administrative underlaps and overlaps we have had to overcome. The Department of National Health and Welfare have available a lot of medical sources, medical hygiene and so on. Actually I do not think it is harming our administration in any way, and as regards education I feel that the field of welfare enters into it just as much as education. I think medical care, welfare and education go hand in hand. We have had every co-operation from the director of Indian health services since 1946.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the method of correlation of health and welfare activities with those of your department?

Mr. JONES: There is a director, my opposite number, the director of Indian health services, who has his own organization and who issues his own directives. Occasionally we issue joint directives for the benefit of the staff of Indian Affairs who must carry out these instructions—I am thinking of the health regulations. Our Indian superintendent is vitally concerned in the administration of this. He is interested in the health of the Indians and in getting certain Indians sent to hospital, or in the payment of certain medical accounts which the Indian health services ask our people to certify. Thus there is a certain amount of clerical work undertaken by the Indian Affairs staff.

Mr. MICHENER: I would think that the centres of hospitalization for Indians would in the main be centres of education, too, and I would like to ask you, taking Moose Factory as an example, whether the maintenance of a hospital there by one department and the maintenance by your department of a school at the same time does not necessarily result in duplication.

Mr. JONES: I cannot visualize—

Mr. MICHENER: Can you give us a practical illustration of how things operate?

Mr. JONES: Moose Factory, subject to my being correct, because this involves another department, is a centre where the Indian health services maintain an Indian hospital.

Mr. MICHENER: I think it is a hospital which has 200 or 300 beds.

Mr. JONES: We have—Indian Affairs has—an agency organization consisting of a superintendent and a clerical staff and then of course there is a residential school which belongs to our department. Our superintendent would have certain administrative functions to perform in relation to the education of the Indians, but the administration of the health services in the James bay area is pretty well handled by the superintendent of the hospital

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think also that the hospital provides services for a much larger area than our agency at Moose Factory.

Mr. JONES: To the extent that they would go farther up into Hudson bay whereas we do not go beyond the top of James bay.

Mr. MICHENER: Both the hospital and the superintendent would look after the Indians of the bay except that the area covered by the health services would extend further north.

Mr. MCLEOD: I think I may be able to tell this committee from my first-hand knowledge about the work which is being done for the education and for the health of the Indian population in my area, and how this is handled. With respect to education, as far as I am aware, there are no separately maintained schools closer than at Kamloops within my own district. The Indian population attends school there in the same way as other Canadians. They come to school on the same basis, they have the same rooms and they are treated in every way as ordinary Canadians. The same arrangement applies to the health services. The local doctors look after the health of the Indians, though the bills are paid by the Department of Health and Welfare. The only difference in so far as the treatment of Indians is concerned is that the doctor has special hours for attending to Indians at his office, usually in the forenoon rather than in the afternoon. Indian patients are also accepted into hospital, and they have a special public ward for them. Some of the Indians, however, are able to pay a little extra for special treatment for their children and for any members of their family, the same as anyone else, but there are a few

from the Indian reserve who do attend the school. Of course it is maintained entirely by the Indian Affairs department but operated in conjunction with some other organization. So far as I can see, there is no discrimination. The Indian children are getting the same treatment as Canadians and, I am satisfied, are becoming good Canadians.

Mr. YUILL: I was wondering to what extent the provinces cooperate with the federal department on welfare, which, I presume, is related to education. Is it on a 50-50 basis, or what is the relationship?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director ought to answer that. Before he became director of the whole branch he was head of the welfare side of the department, and there is no one more competent to speak on that.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the question, Mr. Yuill?

Mr. YUILL: I was curious to know to what degree the provinces and the federal authorities cooperate in the field of social welfare. Is it on a dollars-and-cents basis, shared by each body, or is it just a mutual goodwill gesture on the part of the different organizations?

Mr. JONES: In a general way, I should say that the co-operation between the provinces and the federal government is very good and becoming better. In the field of social welfare, possibly our main difficulties have been in the matter of explaining to the provincial authorities certain matters of which we thought they possibly did not have as clear a concept as we did. For instance, in the matter of Indians residing off reserves, we have always taken the stand that when an Indian goes off a reserve—which he is free to do at any time—and takes up residence in a municipality, he is, of course, like any other resident of the municipality, eligible for welfare services. Sometimes in the past we have had little difficulties with regard to the feeling that Indians, being wards of the government, are the responsibility of the federal government. That is being broken down, because we feel that that is possibly not a true label. "Ward" indicates possibly a legal minor, but an Indian, in that sense, is free to come and go as he likes. So, by approaching the provinces, through conferences, we are receiving very good co-operation. A few years ago we took on our staff professional social workers. One of their tasks was to co-operate very closely with provincial and municipal authorities, and they have done excellent work. We are trying to understand each other's point of view better, and we are getting very good co-operation at the moment from the provinces.

Mr. YUILL: May I ask another question relating to the onus of responsibility for assistance to indigent Indians? What is the policy? Do you really call the municipal authorities in, discuss the matter with them and try to arrive at an equitable conclusion?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am going to ask a question myself, Mr. Yuill. I am going to ask it rather in the form of an affirmation, and Colonel Jones might say if I am wrong. I understand that if the Indian is living on the reserve, the exclusive responsibility is ours, but if he chooses to go off the reserve and live in Edmonton, say, he is just another Canadian citizen like anybody else and we have no responsibility for any services that the province renders. We are responsible for the services that the Canadian government renders to other citizens, but we have no more responsibility for an Indian when he is living in Edmonton than we have for anybody else living in Edmonton. Of course, if he is a member of a band, he can always go back to the reserve.

Mr. YUILL: I understand that there is co-operation in trying to understand that problem.

Mr. JONES: I think that I might answer your question. As the minister says, on the reserve they are our responsibility. Off the reserve they are the responsibility of the municipality. We are working towards agreements with everybody, whereby there will be services available to these people immediately, irrespective of whether they are Indians, or how long they have been there, because the matter of status sometimes takes a little time to determine. Sometimes the matter of residence under provincial legislation takes a little time to establish, owing to shifts from one place to another, but once the residence has been established we find that the municipalities and provinces are very agreeable to accepting that responsibility. It is the in-between cases that possibly cause concern.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They cause concern, of course, with other citizens too.

Mr. THATCHER: I have a few questions. From these estimates there are, I think, about 1,600 people employed in the Indian Affairs department—perhaps slightly more. How many of those would be actually Indians? Is it the policy of the department to hire Indians themselves wherever possible?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the definite policy. As a matter of fact, even at the risk of being told that this is an infringement of the Canada fair employment legislation, I think that it is a good policy. We give Indians the first preference.

Mr. THATCHER: How many approximately would you have?

Mr. JONES: Approximately 10 per cent.

Mr. THATCHER: Approximately 10 per cent of the staff are Indians? I admit that I do not know too much about Indians, but I understand that one of the main problems is to get them to work, is it not? How many have you at the moment on relief, or to how many are you giving direct aid? Have you any idea?

Mr. JONES: I would not have, sir, because the picture fluctuates so rapidly. Some are on permanent relief. Some are on temporary relief and we have no figures because they would be out of date before we got them, owing to the local factors. People who might be on relief for a month or two would then go off.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you a branch of the department whose main job is to get these people to work?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Exactly what do they do? Could you outline that department's work?

Mr. JONES: That comes under our welfare division, headed by our superintendent. The functions of that welfare division are broken down into the economic development and the social welfare. In the economic development, we attempt to help the Indians help themselves to become established in farming, fishing, trapping and small cooperatives on the reserves, aided and abetted, of course, by better educational facilities. It all helps the immediate situation. Through our welfare division we relay to our regional supervisors, who are our head men in each province, all the latest information we can get about projects that are developing on a national scale. Our regional supervisors and our superintendents, who used to be the Indian agents, are in touch with the local employment agents at all times.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you register Indians with the unemployment insurance offices too?

Mr. JONES: The Indians have the same rights off the reserve as anybody else.

Mr. THATCHER: In other words, if they are on relief, you register them with an unemployment office?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They would do it themselves. If they are on the reserves, they would not be registered. If they are off the reserves, it would depend upon themselves.

Mr. THATCHER: Where Indians on a reserve are out of work or are being paid direct relief, would you use them on a project, say, going through their territory?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: But you would not get them through an unemployment office? For instance, are you using Indians on the Chibougamau railroad?

Mr. JONES: Wherever possible. In our own contracts we ask for preference for Indian labour. For any national project we try to get as many Indian employees as possible. In the big military project at Gagetown, New Brunswick, I think that we have about 40 Indians employed, and we hope to step that up to several times this unmber this spring. Part of our field officers' responsibility is to make every possible contact with outside employers for the benefit of Indians.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are some of them not working in that Cold Lake project in Alberta?

Mr. JONES: I cannot say definitely, but I exept that there are.

Mr. THATCHER: Could you give the committee a rough idea of what you paid out in total relief last year, that is in direct assistance?

Mr. JONES: I have that figure here. It is $1,238,944.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is the Indian population in Canada today, by the way?

Mr. FORTIER: Close to 155,000.

Mr. MCLEOD: I should like a little further information on the point which was raised by Mr. Yuill. In your report, where you have separated the activities of the various provinces, there is a statement in the last paragraph dealing with British Columbia:

> In an endeavour to improve social conditions on the reserves, a joint survey was conducted in conjunction with the provincial social welfare branch.

Now we have what is more or less a criticism that has just come to hand from the British Columbia government, that no general survey was undertaken. The only district in which it was conducted was in the district of Masset. This was conducted by a Miss Arnold from your department and a Mr. Kelly of the provincial advisory committee.

Mr. JONES: Miss Arnold is our social worker at our British Columbia office.

Mr. MCLEOD: Was that the only point where a survey was made? From the last paragraph of the report on British Columbia, it would appear that the entire province was covered.

Mr. JONES: Of course, that ended a year ago, and we are hoping that it will continue, subject to time being available to Miss Arnold. She visits various regions.

Mr. MCLEOD: In other words, you have only one representative who is covering this survey?

Mr. JONES: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: I was interested, Mr. Chairman, to hear the minister's remarks concerning the failure of the reserve system. I am sure that has been obvious for years now, and it is encouraging to see attempts being made by the department to deal with this problem.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You used your own phrase, "the failure of the reserve system". I do not want to get into trouble with the Indians. I hope the day will come when the reserve system will no longer be necessary, but every time that I say anything about this subject I get letters from Indians who are afraid that there is a conspiracy afoot to take away their rights. I am not objecting to anything that you have said, but I want to safeguard my own position.

Mr. DINSDALE: I am sorry if I misinterpreted your remarks. Education is basic, and I believe that the committee which sat in 1951 recommended that, in addition to the co-educational program which you have mentioned, mixing Indians with non-Indians, the trend in education should be toward day schools on the reserves and away from residential schools. It seems that residential schools only perpetuate this tendency towards marginal individuals. Are there any figures as to how far that progress has been made since 1951?

Mr. R. F. DAVEY (Superintendent, Education Service Indian Affairs): First of all, perhaps I should explain the purpose for which we now use our residential schools. Admissions to the residential schools are controlled by applications which come to my office. On each application is shown the reason why each local representative is recommending the admission of the child to the school. Now, these fall into three categories. First of all, children who must for various reasons be taken out of their homes, such as orphans, part orphans, or those whose home conditions may be unsatisfactory. The second category is children who cannot attend day classes from their homes. It may be a very small reserve with two or three families and not enough children to warrant the erection of a days school. In that category also come children of families who still lead nomadic or semi-nomadic lives. Those are to be found largely in the north, where the economy is a trapping economy and the families disperse in family groups. The third category is Indian children who require special training which is not available to them from their homes. The increase in the number of children going to day schools is much greater than the increase in the number of children going to residential schools. The increase in residential schools is approximately 2,000. It would take me a few minutes to secure the increase in the day schools as compared with the increase in the residential schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of course, there has been an immense increase in education in the last four years.

Mr. MONTEITH: Are they beginning younger?

Mr. DINSDALE: Staying longer.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Staying longer and going at all. Is that not right?

Mr. DAVEY: Yes, that is correct. I now have those figures. In March, 1950, the enrolment in day schools was 13,986. In 1954, which is the last figure available, it was 17,084. In 1950 the enrolment in residential schools was 9,316; and in 1954 it was 11,090. In other words, the increase has been slightly less than 2,000 at the residential schools. The increase at the day schools has been approximately 3,000.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Those are purely Indian schools?

Mr. DAVEY: Purely.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That does not take account of the considerable number of children who are now being educated at mixed schools or high schools. There are even a few going to university.

Mr. DAVEY: In 1950, the figure for mixed schools was 1,645. In 1954, it was 3,381.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): That is, at the regular schools?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. DINSDALE: With regard to the regular public school attendance, I noted that the minister said he had attended the opening of two new rooms in Sarnia, which has resulted from the extension of this program, I presume.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Our school buildings at Sarnia were antiquated and would have had to be rebuilt. Instead of doing that, we made a deal with the school board—if that is what it is called in Ontario—of the city of Sarnia, by which we paid them the cost of building two more rooms for the school. Of course the Indians did not go into those two rooms—they went all through the school in the proper classes—but by adding those two rooms as a capital investment we were enabled to provide our share of the expense.

Mr. DINSDALE: It is the general policy to supply capital support?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If any school board is near enough to a reserve to make the facilities possible, and where we can make a deal that we would regard as a good business proposition. We are not too tough about it.

Mr. DINSDALE: I presume that is a recent policy, because the report of the Ontario government on Indian Affairs in this province mentioned that as a specific deficiency in this co-educational program.

Mr. FORTIER: It has been in force for at least the last two years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know whether the committee would be interested to know the places where we have agreements now right across Canada.

An Hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Agreements in Effect with School Districts

Place	Province
Alberni	B.C.
Alert Bay	B.C.
Bella Coola	B.C.
Campbell River	B.C.
Hazelton	B.C.
Keene	Ont.
Lytton	B.C.
Masset	B.C.
Nanaimo	B.C.
Oka	Quebec
Pelican Narrows	Sask.
Port Essington	B.C.
Port Hardy	B.C.
Quathiaski Cove	B.C.
Sarnia	Ont.
South Indian Lake	Man.
Stanley	Sask.
Telegraph Creek	B.C.
Agreements under Consideration	
Fredericton	N.B.
Fort Frances	Ont.
Jasper House	Alta.
Maniwaki	Quebec
Melbourne	Ont.
Orillia	Ont.
Southampton	Ont.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Of the last seven some of them are only in the early stage of negotiations.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: What kind of agreement is that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Agreements with local school authorities so that Indian children can be admitted together with other children.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: We have one in Oka—the only place in the province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is not going to be the only place for long. We have just about concluded one in Maniwaki; but Oka was the first.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you pay so much per capita?

Mr. DAVEY: The agreement covers two factors—our contribution toward capital expenditure and to operating costs. In the case of the contribution toward capital expenditure, it is based upon the ratio which the Indian school children bear to the total enrollment of pupils in the school. Such a contribution is made only where it is necessary to add to the existing school premises or to build a new school. We have many places where the school boards will admit our children without asking any contribution toward capital expenditure. The second factor, as I say, is operating cost and the operating costs are paid to the school board on the basis of the net cost of operation to the school board in that particular district.

Mr. DINSDALE: The contribution toward capital expenditure is made on a percentage basis.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is made pro rata. In the case of Sarnia we figured that three rooms only were needed to take the extra children we proposed to send, though of course the children were scattered all through the school.

Mr. DINSDALE: Have there been any new residential schools built since 1951?

Mr. DAVEY: Yes, there have. It will take me a moment before I can tell you how many.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And there will be some more. We must continue to have residential schools for quite a long time in the future in the north, and in remote areas.

Mr. THATCHER: When you build a school to be operated by the department, do you conform to the provincial education standards with regard to teachers' qualifications and so on?

Mr. DAVEY: We follow the provincial curricula. We do make some minor adaptations. For example one introduces a unit of health which deals with tuberculosis.

Mr. DINSDALE: And are your teachers required to have provincial certificates?

Mr. DAVEY: As far as we can do so at the present time. Our salary scale discourages teachers from staying with us when they are not in possession of certificates. A teacher who has not had professional training and who is without experience would start at $1,300 a year, so members of the committee can see we would not get many teachers in that category. Teachers who hold a first class certificate—the designation of the certificate varies from province to province—start at $2,200.

Mr. HELLYER: What do you mean by "first class certificate"?

Mr. DAVEY: The equivalent of one year of normal school training plus one year of academic work at university level. But if a teacher holds even an interim first class certificate issued by the province we classify him as holding a first class certificate.

Mr. THATCHER: Are you getting any Indians to train as teachers?

Mr. DAVEY: Yes, we are employing now sixty-four Indian teachers all of whom are normal school graduates.

Mr. MICHENER: The children of the trapping families of James bay either go out with their families and live in the winter on the trap lines and miss their education, or else they stay in and miss their Indian education in how to trap animals and live the lives of their ancestors. How is that problem dealt with?

Mr. DAVEY: That is a very difficult problem for us. First of all we tried to solve it at Moose Factory, for example, by having a trap line set up as the property of the school and then operated by the children at the schools. They got some training in trapping and they also got some training in the preparation and marketing of furs. The second thing which we try to do is to operate at point where Indian families congregate during the summertime—seasonal schools—and so we have for the past several years operated part of our school at Moose Factory during the summer months to serve the families there.

Mr. MICHENER: That strikes me as the only way in which the Indian children can get both sorts of education, and keep up his special skills.

Mr. DAVEY: There is one problem related to that, which is that the Indian population is increasing much more rapidly than trap lines can be provided to absorb it, so we feel that we must give them a basic training which will permit them to receive specialist training along vocational lines to enable them to get jobs.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Unfortunately it is often the other way around, though in Manitoba a wonderful job on muskrats has been done. But unhappily the price of muskrats went down.

Mr. DINSDALE: There is a general shortage of educational training facilities in Canada. You make some attempt to overcome this in your schools. Do you combine them with the regular provincial curricula?

Mr. DAVEY: We try to avoid setting up technical training schools because that would mean a duplication of the provincial facilities and most of our pupils are so widely scattered that it would be quite impossible for us to set up training schools which would be comparable with what the provinces have now been able to provide. We do, however, find that the Indian, particularly in the north, is handicapped because of the provincial requirements for admission to these special schools. We are trying to get over that difficulty. We have started several experimental projects to give the Indians training in certain basic skills which we think will enable them to find employment much more readily than they can now. One of the problems of the Indian is that, in many cases, he is not equipped to compete with non-Indians. We are giving certain basic training in cooperation with the municipal authorities, and where that is not possible because of isolation, at our own schools.

Mr. GARLAND: I have two or three short questions concerning the maintenance of the roads. I am not speaking of the erection of new roads, but the maintenance of existing roads. Is there a definite policy for the maintenance of roads on the reserves?

Mr. JONES: Yes, there is. We have a substantial vote each year to maintain roads on Indian reserves.

Mr. GARLAND: Do you utilize the working forces available on the reserves?

Mr. JONES: Yes. In addition we have available in some localities road machinery either board owned or departmentally owned. It does give much useful employment to Indians in the spring, summer and fall.

Mr. GARLAND: Do you take full responsibility for the maintenance of the roads on the reserves?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr GARLAND: To go a step further, where a reserve adjoins an organized township and the road through an Indian township is maintained solely for the use of the Indians, do you take the financial responsibility there?

Mr. JONES: You are speaking of the connecting road to the reserve?

Mr. GARLAND: That is right. If I can make it clear, a road maintained in an organized township by that township for the exclusive use of the Indians.

Mr. JONES: We have many requests for that type of assistance, Mr. Garland. We attempt to evaluate each one on its own merits, and quite often where we have found that the municipality is suffering because a road is used entirely by Indians, we attempt to make some arrangement with the municipality, but I do not think that we have any responsibility.

Mr. GARLAND: Where the road is used jointly by the Indians and the residents of the municipality, have you assisted in any degree?

Mr. JONES: We have assisted on occasion.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are a little more generous than the village of Rockcliffe, where I live, is in its attitude to Ottawa.

Mr. DINSDALE: On this road question, Colonel Jones—

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Could I say a word before we go on? Has the committee any idea when it will conclude with my department? Time is going on and I have other urgent business to attend to.

Mr. MICHENER: Indian Affairs is the last part of this, is it not?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I think that with a good day tomorrow we might finish.

The CHAIRMAN: I had in mind having a meeting tomorrow at 11 o'clock, because we cannot obtain the committee room until 11. If we meet at 3.30 p.m. tomorrow, we will have to adjourn at 4.45. I am sure that everybody on the committee will want to hear Mr. Dulles, and if we do not adjourn by a quarter to five the members of this committee will not be able to get into the room.

Mr. GARLAND: I wonder if there are no items which are not controversial and which could be passed now?

An Hon. MEMBER: No.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Does the committee think we should get through tomorrow, because we have a cabinet meeting on Friday morning. There is a meeting of this committee scheduled, and I would come to this committee in preference to the cabinet meeting, but I would not like to miss it if I do not have to.

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in room 277 and at 3.30 p.m. in this room.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 14

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1955
FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. K. Abbott, Personnel Officer; Mr. H. M. Jones, Director, Miss M. Walton, Administrative Officer, and Mr. R. Davey, Superintendent, Educational Division, all of the Indian Affairs Branch.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55384—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Decore
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Fulton
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lafontaine
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Pickersgill
Starr
Stuart (*Charlotte*)
Thatcher
Yuill—26

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, March 18, 1955

The Special Committee on Estimates begs leave to present the following as its

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee has considered and approved items numbered 59 to 83 inclusive, listed in the Main Estimates 1955-56 relating to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, referred to it by the House on February 22, 1955.

A copy of the Proceedings of the Committee in respect thereof is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WALTER A. TUCKER,
Chairman.

55384—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 17, 1955.
(15)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Fulton, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Lafontaine, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Pickersgill, Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. H. M. Jones, Director, Miss M. Walton, Administrative Officer, Mr. R. Davey, Superintendent, Educational Division, all of the Indian Affairs Branch; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer, and Mr. J. K. Abbott, Personnel Officer.

The Minister supplied information requested at previous meetings, concerning the Immigration and Citizenship Branches and corrected some information that had been given earlier.

The Committee resumed the consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Indian Affairs Branch.

Items numbered 71 to 73 inclusive were adopted.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

(16)

The Special Committee on Estimates resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Deschatelets, Fulton, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lafontaine, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, Yuill, Pickersgill.

In attendance: Same as at morning sitting.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Indian Affairs Branch.

The Minister and his officials explained the items under consideration and also supplied information requested at previous meetings.

Items numbered 74 to 80 inclusive were approved.

At 4.50 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 9.30 o'clock a.m. Friday, March 18.

FRIDAY, March 18, 1955.
(17)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 9.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Fulton, Garland, Hellyer, Jutras, Lafontaine, MacEachen, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Pickersgill, Starr, Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration*: Mr. Laval Fortier, Deputy Minister; Mr. W. J. Brennan, Departmental Administrative Officer, and Mr. H. M. Jones, Director, Indian Affairs Branch.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates, Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Items numbered 70 and 59 were adopted.

Members of the Committee thanked the Minister and his officials for their co-operation and for the information supplied to the Committee.

The Committee continued its sitting *in camera*.

The Chairman submitted a draft "Report to the House".

Following discussion and consideration of a number of proposed amendments to the draft report, the said report was approved unanimously, without amendment.

Agreed,—That the Chairman present the said Report to the House.

At 11.15 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 17, 1955.
11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum gentlemen. The committee will please come to order.

We are on the items numbered 70 to 80 inclusive in the estimates of the Indian Affairs branch.

Hon. JOHN W. PICKERSGILL (*Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*): Before we start on item number 70, Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of questions left over from yesterday which perhaps I should deal with now.

One had to do with the Citizenship branch and we undertook to furnish the accounts submitted by the various provinces for these joint citizenship classes. The accounts are here. If I hold them up I think I will frighten the committee into asking me not to read them but to leave them available for inspection. Perhaps this afternoon it could be indicated whether there is anything in them which anyone would like published. They are rather detailed and there is a list of all the schools in Ontario. Some of the provinces do not submit a list of schools. I am quite willing to have these files inspected by any member of the committee who wishes to inspect them and if there is anything which he feels should be put on the record I would be happy to put it on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: These are the agreements with the provinces in regard to paying the cost of these language classes?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Which we also provide with textbooks.

Would that be satisfactory to the committee?

Agreed.

There is a question which was asked by Mr. Dinsdale, who is not here today, about the proportion of day and residential schools operating. I have the figures here for every year from 1946 to 1954. Perhaps I could file it and have it inserted into the record.

Schools Operating

Year	Residential	Day
1946	76	262
1947	76	265
1948	73	285
1949	72	309
1950	69	329
1951	67	365
1952	66	390
1953	67	389
1954	67	394

The new residential schools built since 1950 I think I should give to the committee. There have been three new schools built; one at Seven Islands which was completed in 1952, one at Lower Post in northern British Columbia, and one at Amos which is in northwestern Quebec which is not quite completed yet. Then, there have been four reconstructed; one at Norway House in Manitoba; one at Carcross which is in the Yukon, one at Moose Fort which is in Ontario and one at Ermineskins which is in Alberta.

Then I am also told that we misled the committee some days ago about the number of motor vehicles when we said we have 181 and it turns out we have 184. These vehicles consist of 92 trucks, 72 motor cars, 9 jeeps, 7 snowmobiles, 4 school buses. This does not include one truck operated by the National Gallery of Canada.

Mr. MONTEITH: Are those all in the Indian Affairs branch except 5?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think there are five in Europe belonging to the Immigration Branch but all the rest are for Indian Affairs.

Mr. THATCHER: Do all the cars you have in your department have a stamp on them indicating that they belong to the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are marked Canada—Department of Citizenship and Immigration and anything else we wish to put on. I think in the Indian Affairs branch they put Indian Affairs Branch underneath the name of the department.

Mr. MONTEITH: The statement was made yesterday, I think, that the Indian population was roughly 150,000 or slightly over. I am given to understand that that is an increase over recent years. Is that right? When approximately did the upswing start?

Mr. H. M. JONES (*Director of Indian Affairs Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration*): After the turn of the century.

Mr. MONTEITH: When some attention started to be given to their health conditions and so on?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it is a direct result of better health today. By chance I hitchhiked down this morning with Dr. John Wherrett, the head of the National Tuberculosis Association and we were talking about this very question, and he said it is really quite amazing the speed with which this problem is being overtaken now, and this success is of course, as I said, creating a new problem for us in that we are going to have more Indians staying alive than can make their living in the traditional way in the north; and in these remoter parts of the country we have got to find some other way to enable them to make a living.

Mr. MONTEITH: Has anybody any approximate idea what the low ebb of the Indian population was; what did it get down to at any stage?

Mr. JONES: We could obtain that information for you.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It would show in the 1901 and 1911 censuses. If we looked at the census for 1891, 1901 and 1911 it would show.

Mr. JONES: It went down to the 100,000 mark I believe and is up now to 153,000 roughly. The last census would show in five years a net increase of about 3,000 a year.

Mr. MICHENER: Who are classed as Indians in making up that population of 153,000?

Mr. JONES: Only members of bands, Indians entitled to be registered as Indians under the Indian Act.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Indians who belong to bands and it would not include any person, even though he is entirely of Indian origin, who lives off the reserve and is not a member of a band although he would be shown as of Indian race in the census of the racial origins.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): He would be included in the census as part of the Indian population?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In the census of origins I believe he would. I would imagine the number of people of North American Indian origin in the ordinary census would be somewhat higher than the number shown as Indians under the Act.

Mr. MICHENER: I would be interested in having some explanation of the significance of the band and how one ceases to be a member and how one obtains the franchise and whether there is movement back and forth. Without our having to study the Act too carefully perhaps Colonel Jones could indicate the relationship between an Indian in and out of the band and what the significance is on his rights as a Canadian citizen?

Mr. JONES: Well, the matter of an enfranchisement is entirely voluntary. It is contained in the Indian Act. There are approximately 800 already enfranchised. They give up all rights which they may have as an Indian citizen and become an ordinary citizen of Canada.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And it is irrevocable.

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: An Indian can leave the reserve and still belong to the band.

Mr. MICHENER: His name remains on the roll and he can come back?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Does he have to sign a waiver of his treaty rights to become enfranchised?

Mr. JONES: He has to make an application and by order in council he becomes enfranchised.

Mr. MICHENER: I have an article here on the Canadian Indian, which says that there are 600 separate communities known as bands living on about 2,200 reserves. Is there a separate roll for each reserve or for each band?

Mr. JONES: For each band.

Mr. MICHENER: Where are they kept?

Mr. JONES: In the agency headquarters and head office.

Mr. MICHENER: When an Indian decides to renounce his rights he is taken off that roll and becomes an ordinary Canadian citizen?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: He is not counted in the census?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: He would not be counted as an Indian under the Indian Act, but he would be a North American Indian for racial origin purposes.

Mr. GARLAND: Are those lists available?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand they are available for public inspection.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What is the position of an Indian in British Columbia who wishes to become enfranchised with respect to his rights in the tribal property real estate and so forth. Does he have to relinquish all his rights?

Mr. JONES: On enfranchisement the Indian is paid off his share of the band assets, trust fund. For instance, if an Indian, his wife and three children became enfranchised there would be five shares of the trust fund paid to them and that extinguishes any further right they may have to band funds.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): They do not have any further rights if there was sale of real estate of which they did not have a share at the time of enfranchisement?

Mr. JONES: No. That finishes any rights they might have.

Mr. GARLAND: Is that a straight cash settlement?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: And that affects an Indian and his descendants?

Mr. JONES: They all become non-Indians legally.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There are, of course, right now on the Pacific coast a number of Indian reserves that are increasing in value very rapidly and I know of a number of cases of Indians who would like to be enfranchised and are well qualified to be citizens but who have an eye to the increasing value of the property and hesitate to do it. Has the government considered that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have a problem there. This is a problem to which I have had to give some consideration. We have just about got to the point where one whole band might be enfranchised as a band, and it was hoped that a municipality would be established where the reserve had been. But, according to the law—and it is very intricate indeed—if the whole band is enfranchised the real property then reverts back to the province. I suggested that we explore the possibilities of dividing the land up first so that there would be nothing left to revert, and there are great complications about that. They wanted to have some communal property belonging to the municipality and they would have had to give it back again. I was afraid it might be regarded as a colourable device and thrown out by the courts. If I have an opportunity I am going to discuss this with the attorney general of British Columbia who I understand is coming here to attend one of the committees which is allowed to hear witnesses. Particularly in British Columbia it is a very real problem where some of these Indians are very advanced and could be running their own affairs.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): In British Columbia for some years they have had the provincial franchise.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: All they have to do, as I understand it, anywhere to get the federal franchise—they do not have to cease to be Indians—is simply to renounce their right to be exempt from income tax. This exemption from income tax is not worth a great deal. I am speaking off the cuff on this, but I understand what is exempted from income tax is the money they make on the reserve, but if they earn any income outside the reserve they have to pay income tax on that. Actually most of the Indians who stay on the reserves and who have any considerable families would be taxable, if at all,—for such a minute amount that it is much more a matter of form than of substance. As I understand it there is no other obstacle.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What would be the difference between just enfranchising them for the purpose of the federal vote and complete citizenship. What is denied them if they relinquish as Indians altogether?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Then they would get paid off, as the director said, and have no longer any share in the band property, and if they should become indigent they are no longer cared for as Indians.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are there any disabilities removed which remain on them if they are Indians but with the vote?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think there are any disabilities.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I am wondering why they would do it ?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suppose they want to go off and live in another place. There are not too many Indians who want to be enfranchised.

Mr. JONES: One of the requirements is that they be 21 years of age or over and that they have been living off the reserve and have been making their way in a community and that they are not likely to become a public charge. They have really abandoned their Indian way of life.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is for enfranchisement and that does not mean being given the vote.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): They can be given the vote if they live on the reserve and sign this waiver?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Have any?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: About half of the provinces have given Indians the vote. They have the vote in British Columbia, in Manitoba, and in Ontario, although it has never been exercised yet, I believe, except in one by-election; in Nova Scotia they have always had it, I think. They also have the franchise in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MICHENER: The federal franchise is dependent on the waiver?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not entirely. Veterans have it anyway.

Mr. MICHENER: Are the enumerators furnished with the list of those who have signed this waiver or how do they make up the voter's list for a federal election?

Mr. JONES: I really do not know. There have been approximately 50 Indians who have signed the waiver. I would think it would be done through the Indian superintendent.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I imagine the returning officer would go to the Indian superintendent in any reserve in his district and say "Are there any Indians here who have signed the waiver?"

The CHAIRMAN: He would get the list of those who served in the army and this other list at the same time I suppose?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. MICHENER: I have a question which involves procedure for expulsion from the band. I think I would best raise this by referring to editorials on the consequences of this procedure which I have here. One is from the Calgary *Herald* of September 4, 1954. I will just read enough of it to indicate what the complaint is as the Indian sees it:

> The section of the Act dealing with blood lineage, and the question it raises concerning the right of some persons now enjoying Indian status to continue doing so, is causing nothing but dissension and trouble among the tribes. We have already had some experience of this in Alberta, particularly on the Hobbema reserve, where vague allegations have been made.—

That is, vague allegations for the purpose of expelling a man from the reserve.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Some of them are very far from vague.

Mr. MICHENER:

> "And, because they are so vague, can be refuted only with great difficulty—against the right of some people to continue living on the reserve. The trouble has now spread to Saskatchewan, where the status of some of the most prominent members of the tribes living in that province is being attacked."

Now, that is one place where this matter came to my attention. The other one was in the Saskatoon article of September 18, 1954. I do not know what the section of the Act is, but I understand there was a new procedure established by which one Indian could complain about the status of another and then an inquiry is made, and that this procedure has been the cause of very considerable controversy and dissatisfaction. I would like to hear what the department's experience and comment is.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to say a little about this matter myself. It is section 5 and subsequent sections, "Definition and Registration of Indians",

in the Act beginning on page 3 up to and including section 10 I believe. As a matter of fact, there are quite a number of sections right on to section 18.

Mr. MICHENER: I understand there is a new procedure?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. The procedure, as I understand it from my predecessor, was put in not to create a problem but to try to solve a problem of very long standing. There had been disputes, and some of them very acrimonious disputes, in some of these bands over many years as to who was entitled to belong and who was not entitled to belong. I believe that some of the Indians are still a little casual about vital statistics, and that problems do arise more frequently there than they sometimes do in the rest of the community. A lot of the Indian agents were selected over the years for more practical considerations rather than their qualities of keeping good records and the result was that some of these band lists were in a rather dubious state. It was felt that some way should be found to settle, once and for all, all these things that were causing disputes.

That ties in with another problem. There are estates that have to be settled and the settlement of these estates depends sometimes on knowing who is entitled to be considered an Indian, and it was provided that, in those reserves where such disputes existed, the minister could appoint a commissioner to hear these grievances and report to the registrar. There seems to be a mistaken idea in that editorial and the article in the Saskatoon paper which I have read; there seems to be a mistaken idea that these commissioners were to determine the matter. All they were to do was to report, and the determination was made by the registrar whose conduct I have to answer for to parliament. I believe that most of these commissioners have completed their work, but I do not believe that the registrar has made a final determination in any of the cases referred to the commissioners. It was felt that we ought to have all the reports first and be able to see the whole picture. Also of course what the registrar says is not final. There is an appeal from the registrar's decision to the courts.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): In quite a number of these tribes, matriarchal descent is regarded by the Indians themselves as the correct way of judging inheritance.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That might solve a lot of problems.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I know of cases myself where members of the band have insisted on the right to live in the reserve purely by their descent from their mother.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that the inquiry comes about by the suggestion of one Indian that another is not entitled to live on the reserve and there are quite a number of those in the Hobbema reserve.

Mr. JONES: I do not recall having a great number of protests in the Hobbema reserve.

Mr. MICHENER: It apparently started up some controversy?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: In Saskatchewan do you recall how many cases were made the subject of this kind of inquiry and reported to the registrar?

Mr. JONES: There were 294 protests in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MICHENER: Against specific people?

Mr. JONES: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Remaining on the band list?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: And that would be on the basis of their status?

Mr. JONES: Not entirely. It was in quite a few cases a question of membership rather than status. There was no question about their being Indians, but it was a question as to whether they belonged in this particular reserve or not.

Mr. MICHENER: Of course, on that kind of question if they were Indians they would belong on a reservation. It is just a question of whether they belong to that reservation; but the other kind of question is whether a man is entitled to enjoy Indian status at all?

Mr. JONES: A lot of the protests in Saskatchewan were not a question of being Indians but a question of not belonging in that band list which was posted as showing them as belonging to a certain band. It is not a question of ruling them as not being Indians but rather a question of membership.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think it might interest the committee to see what the proportions of this problem are across the country. This table here is divided between those disputes that were turned over to commissioners and those that were settled by the departmental officer without any further protest, and where the departmental officer could settle a dispute to the satisfaction of both parties we did not waste any time sending it to a commissioner.

In British Columbia there were 44 of the first kind sent to the commissioner and 52 investigated by the departmental officer decided by him, and there are two before the department which have not been settled yet. In Alberta there were 44 referred to the commissioner, 31 settled by the department and 4 still under consideration. In Saskatchewan there were 240 cases which went to the commissioner. There seems to be a lot more disputes about the matter on the reserves in Saskatchewan than elsewhere. There were 54 settled by the department and one in the third category. In Manitoba there were 21 referred to the commissioner, 14 settled by the department and 6 still before the departmental officer. In Ontario there were 52 referred to the commissioners, 50 settled by the department and 40 still in the process of being considered. In Quebec there were 25 sent to the commissioners, 50 settled by the department and 10 still being considered by the departmental officers. There have been no commissions in New Brunswick, the Yukon or the Northwest Territories, but there have been a number of cases in New Brunswick settled by the department.

Mr. MICHENER: Those numbers are the total from the time the inquiry became effective?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: From the time of the passing of the new Act.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it the intention of the department to keep this procedure available?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would hope that once we get the current disputes the records will be kept well enough that these disputes will very rarely arise.

Mr. MICHENER: You have had the brunt of them now?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is a backlog, and that is why when the Act was amended this provision was put in and I understand that the Indians were consulted about it.

Mr. MICHENER: How many of these cases are still awaiting decisions?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There would be 426 that were submitted to the commissioners. Most of them have been reported on but have not been acted on by the registrar. There are 65 still under consideration by the department and then there are 296 that were settled by the department without going to a commission.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the expectation with respect to those cases which have to be settled by the department?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The ones which are before the department I think will most likely be settled. With respect to the ones before the commissions,

there is one real difficulty we may have. The deputy minister is not here and perhaps I can speak out of school. I understand that the courts have said that the whole onus of proof is on the department and that is a fine general principle with which I agree, but when someone is claiming he is the member of a band and he is the only person who could conceivably have any evidence, it poses a problem which I think not only the lawyers present but the laymen here will appreciate. It may be that we will have to take one of these cases to a higher court or propose that parliament clarify the law. That is one of the difficulties I have to wrestle with when I have a little time. There is one case I am told of someone who is alleged to be, and who gives every outward evidence of being, an Englishman born in England who claims to be a member of a band. You and I and the other laymen would think he is, but if the onus is on us to prove that he is not an Indian it will pose a real problem.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if the minister would tell us which is the most wealthy band?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Probably in Alberta; your possibility of doing research would be as good as mine.

Mr. MICHENER: Has the department run into the problem of having members of one Indian tribe move from one band to a more wealthy band?

Mr. JONES: No. The band councils are very jealous of their band lists and there are not very many transfers between one band and another. It has to be with the consent of the band council and the minister.

Mr. DINSDALE: I would like to ask some questions about the success of the elected councils. I believe an attempt is being made to transfer more responsibility to the elected councils in the reserve and sections 80 and 82 of the Act outline the responsibilities which can be assumed by the elected councils. How successful is this scheme turning out?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director should answer that question.

Mr. JONES: There is every indication that it has been very successful. 325 bands have been placed under the election provision of section 73 of the Act and of the 325 bands 275 have held elections in accordance with the regulations governing Indian band election made pursuant to section 75, so that we have 275 bands now that are operating like municipalities with elections every two years.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I understand they have elected a rather high proportion of women.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I was wondering if our heriditary chieftainships enter into these things, that they tend to elect people who would normally occupy positions as chief of the tribe?

Mr. JONES: I would say where that type of leadership is very strong would be where a band has not yet come under the elective provisions of the Act. Members of elective councils appear to be changing fairly regularly. There are 50 or 60 women who are already on the councils, and I also believe that there are 3 women chiefs.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I was asking this because as a matter of fact one of the councils of one of the bands in my constituency summoned me before them to deal with some matters and the young chief, or whatever the new title is—the head of the band council—remarked in the course of conversation that certain things had taken place in his father's term of office, and I wondered whether they are tending to elect the people who under their own system would inherit the offices or whether they are departing from that.

Mr. JONES: They seem to be electing the leading citizen of the community. There seems to be every indication of that taking place.

Mr. DINSDALE: Some of these elected chiefs and councils are taking their responsibilities very seriously. What is the division of jurisdiction between the agent and the councils? Is there any possibility of those two spheres of influence coming into conflict on a reserve?

Mr. JONES: The superintendent really is the connecting link between the Indians and the minister. He is the advisor to the council. In times past the Indian agent probably acted as chairman a good many times but now the chief is chairman as he should be. The Indian superintendent comes there as a friend, counsellor and advisor, but the emphasis is all on having them run their own affairs, make their own resolutions, appoint committees to look into matters and disputes rather than recommending that the agent do these jobs. The emphasis is entirely on having them run their own affairs.

Mr. DINSDALE: The decisions reached in council would be binding on that particular reserve; is that right?

Mr. JONES: Should be final?

Mr. DINSDALE: Yes. Should take precedence?

Mr. JONES: In many cases it is, with the exception of the voting of money which they do in the form of resolution and when it comes in it is approved or rejected in Ottawa.

Mr. DINSDALE: On this question of conflict in jurisdiction do you find that many chiefs complain that their decisions are being thwarted?

Mr. JONES: Occasionally.

Mr. DINSDALE: By the acts of the agent?

Mr. JONES: It is not widespread. I might give you an instance of how this is working out. More and more we are having the Indian councils budget the same as a municipality each year—and they are coming in now every day for the minister's approval. They are looking ahead, and they figure out how much they have coming in and how much money they are going to spend. They sit down and spend many evenings budgeting for the coming year.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if they have estimate committees.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact there seem to be an awful lot of them lately. When I cannot find anything else to do I sit down and read these budgets. I have to sign them all. I do not add them up to see if they add up. I look at them to see whether the funds exceed the expenditure and I glance at what the expenditure is. I do not pretend to do a detailed audit of these proposals for expenditures. It would be quite impossible for me to do it, but I believe it is done quite carefully by the department. They are not recommended to me until they have been found satisfactory by the department.

Mr. DINSDALE: It seems to me that agricultural activities are very important in this transition of the Indian from dependency to independency because these councils make decisions as to improvement of agricultural techniques and general agricultural activities in the reservation. Where does the direction come for improvement in that regard?

Mr. JONES: With the exception of the minister having the final say in the voting of money, the Indian council has the authority to propose measures for the advancement or welfare of Indians. If they wanted to set up a community farm, of course, it would involve money but within that we are encouraging the Indians and the councils to set up these band projects. It is much better for them to do it than for our staff to undertake the entire responsibility.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have done a little prodding once or twice. When I was down in Sarnia and I saw these fields on the edge of the city growing up with weeds because the Indians in the Sarnia reserve nearly all have jobs working in industry where they can make more money, I said to the chief and the members of council whom I met there: I do not like to see those weeds; if you do not want to farm that land yourself, why do you not rent those farms and get some revenue for the band from them and have them cultivated instead of being grown up with weeds.

Farming is being done to a great extent by the Indians in Saskatchewan and there has been an immense improvement in agricultural methods, all over the prairie provinces.

Mr. DINSDALE: I wonder if the type of agricultural project taking place in southern Manitoba is typical. The Grisworld reserve seems to be fairly active, but the Oak Lake reserve is completely inactive. I wondered who has responsibility for doing something?

Mr. JONES: As you know, particularly in the west, we have what used to be called farming instructors, but are now assistants Indian agency. Their main duty is to live on these small reserves with the Indians, help them and encourage them to farming activities either on an individual basis or on a community basis. Some groups seem to fit into the scheme very well and become keenly interested in agriculture; others are slow or do not wish to become farmers possibly as quickly as we might desire. Each group is really on their own. I cannot explain, if they have comparable lands, why one group will go ahead faster than the other. But, we do try to promote agricultural activities particularly in the west through employment of people who are experienced in agriculture.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think many of you who were brought up on farms, as I was, know that you can have two farms side by side with the same type of land and one will look much better than the other. It depends on the farmer.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I would like to bring up the matter of the decisions that are taken at the meetings held by the Indians themselves where they pass these resolutions which are submitted finally to the department. I have some problems concerning the sale of timber on reserves. Now, I think the procedure is that the agent who is administering that special reserve is made acquainted with the problem first of these timber rights and then it is submitted to the Indians at a general meeting and the agent is at the meeting and a decision is taken in a resolution. I believe that the resolutions are not always to the advantage of the Indian, and I also believe that it is a good thing to have the final decision made by the minister here because there are some injustices to the Indians through these sales of timber. They sometimes are very hungry or very anxious to get an operation going in order to provide work or with the hope of benefitting from having these grounds opened up; and they too hastily go into these agreements. You have it happening in all tribes. In our own Indians we have some who are racketeers in these things and are trying to influence the Indians to support resolutions which are detrimental to the Indians.

I also wish to state here that there are certain regulations laid down by the department towards the operation which to me is absolutely ridiculous. It might have been alright in 1850 but now it should be revised. It is not practicable. It is not economical to either the Indians or to whoever deals with Indians on the reserve.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: What especially did you have in mind?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I will tell you. I was told by the department that I had to employ Indian help. That was all right with me. It did not

matter how the logs were cut, but it mattered how they got to the mill in the spring to be manufactured. That does not seem to be of great importance to the people here administering the Act. Either they do not know or are not interested. They force you to use Indian labour. It is quite all right to use Indian labour, but every Indian wants to cut logs and in an operation you cannot have everybody cutting logs. Somebody has to skid them and haul them and so on. But you cannot stop them. They say I am cutting logs, and they all cut logs, and you cannot bring in outside help and the first thing you know you have a lot of topped logs and no one to pick them up. There are ways and means of doing it. I did not consult the department as to how I would do it. I am not going to tell you how I did it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think all of us at times have found that we have to find our way around regulations when we could not get through them; even ministers have that experience occasionally. Perhaps the director would like to say something about this. It just so happens that I never encountered this particular kind of complaint before. I can see that you might sometimes meet that kind of situation.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I think the committee would be interested to know that our timber regulations were revised in the month of December last.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): That probably will eliminate a lot of these things. As long as it is under consideration or under revision that answers my question.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am afraid that my face should be red because the regulations were revised since I became minister and they could not be revised without my signing the recommendation to have them revised. It would appear that I had not given perhaps quite as much attention as I should have given to these regulations before I recommended them. But I have found in my limited experience in the department that the officials are not only conscientious but what they are trying to do more than anything else is to get the Indians to take responsibility for their affairs and be self-supporting. You do have certain difficulties when you do that, as we all know very well. It is not very different really—I hope that this will not be offensive to any of the Indians—from bringing up a family. When you give certain responsibilities to your children, you have to take the consequences of giving them responsibilities in order to learn. No doubt sometimes some of these responsibilities which have been given to them, which they ought to have, they do not exercise in quite the way we would exercise them. That is no doubt why the minister has a veto. But, in general I have no power to impose my judgment. I can say "No, you cannot do that that way because it is impractical", but I cannot go and say, for instance, in the case I mentioned at Sarnia, that they have to lease that land. It is for them to decide. I can say "you cannot lease it", but I cannot say "you must lease it".

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have only one reporter this morning and he has been at it steadily for an hour, and I wonder if the committee would agree to suspending our deliberations for five minutes in order to give him a chance to rest a bit, and then after the five minutes we will resume and perhaps leave item 70 until the last taking up the items one by one through the list and then come back to item 70 administration at the end.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: We are not through with administration?

The CHAIRMAN: No. We will leave 70 and take the items, item by item.

—Upon resuming.

The CHAIRMAN: We will resume, and take item 71, operation and maintenance of Indian agencies.

Mr. MONTEITH: This is a financial matter, but before you get into that I do not think that the trust accounts come up in the items, do they?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They would come under item 73, reserves and trusts, operating and maintenance.

Mr. MONTEITH: All right.

Mr. MICHENER: Where does the interest payment on the trust fund appear in the estimates?

The CHAIRMAN: Could we take item 71 first. The details of that are on page 152. The question you are asking now would come under 73. We are on 71.

Mr. CAMERON *(Nanaimo)*: I wonder if the director could give us some idea about the qualifications you look for in the Indian agents. What academic training and so on do you ask for?

Mr. JONES: We do not rate education as the only asset. It is useful to have at least high school education but we look for people who have had experience in agriculture or in a field of social welfare and we hope to have in our placement program young people who have had some business training and who have picked up ideas as they go along which have been of some use to them—people between the ages of 30 and 40—and who see an opportunity for someone in the field of human relations. We do not stress, nor do I think we should, a university education. But a high school qualification is very desirable.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I might say a little something from my own observations. I think the essential qualification is that they should be practical people who can turn their hands to almost anything, understand a little about mending machinery and a great deal about how to get on with other human beings, and particularly the kind of person who does not try to boss the Indians. Actually the same kind of people you look for in Boy Scoutmasters. The indefinable qualities are in my opinion the most important thing; and also that they have good wives.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is that a quality only looked for in Indian work?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is also useful for politicians, Mr. Monteith, as you know.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thatcher and then Mr. Deschatelets are next on my list.

Mr. DESCHALELETS: My question is under the heading of administration.

Mr. MICHENER: On the question we are talking about, Indian agents, I see there are two main groups: the superintendents, and their salary ranges from $2,790 to $5,500, and the assistant Indian agents of whom there are 107 whose salaries range from $2,130 to $3,210. Would assistant Indian agents be in charge on their own responsibility in any area or would they always be under a superintendent?

Mr. JONES: In all cases but two they are under a superintendent possibly looking after one of smaller reserves.

Mr. MICHENER: I was thinking of a salary with a top of $3200 for a man given responsibility over a band of Indians. Are there other things which make that up or is it a total salary?

Mr. JONES: In most cases there is also a house, fuel and light.

Mr. MICHENER: That is a very different story.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have a feeling myself that the salaries are on the low side as compared with other salaries in the public service. One of the reasons for that is that the Indian Affairs branch during the years of the war

was necessarily and inevitably somewhat neglected. A lot of the younger men who would have gone in and in the normal course advanced in the service went to the war and became veterans and went off to something else. It is just slowly, as with other civilian agencies which suffered during the war, being built up again.

Mr. MICHENER: Could we have the distribution of superintendents by provinces? It is 81 on the list there, or 82.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have the whole staff here. I think this will indicate it pretty clearly. This is what is asked for this year: headquarters 13, Maritimes 31, Quebec, 31, Northern Ontario, 42, Southern Ontario, 44, Manitoba 48, Saskatchewan 57, Alberta which includes the Northwest Territories I believe 81, and British Columbia which I believe includes the Yukon Territory 86.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): That is the number of agents you have in each province?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the total number of employees in the agencies. The director has the number of superintendents.

Mr. JONES: British Columbia 18, Northwest Territories 2, Alberta 10, Saskatchewan 8, Manitoba 7, Ontario 22, Quebec 10, and the Maritimes 6. We have 107 assistants if you would like those.

Mr. MICHENER: I think that goes far enough for my purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are those distributed roughly on an Indian population basis, pro rata of population?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It looks like that to me. It is population sometimes plus—if I may coin a word—scatteration.

Mr. JONES: Ontario is the largest with 22 superintendents and British Columbia is next with 18 superintendents. This is fairly representation as Ontario has approximately 37,000 Indians with British Columbia having the next largest Indian population of 32,000.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): You mean Indian agents?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The title now has been changed. I still call them Indian agents in private as I was brought up under the old regime.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry 71?

Carried.

Item 72, "Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment." The details are on page 153.

Mr. THATCHER: There are not many details.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: If anyone would like any more details I have a certain amount here. Would someone like an explanation of this?

Mr. THATCHER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It provides for the property or construction of residence such as buildings required for the administration of the Indian Affairs branch, and these buildings are for the department not for Indians; for the construction of roads and bridges essential to the economy of the reserve for efficient administration; for the construction of power and telephone lines, water supplies, sewerage systems; for equipment of all kinds including cars, trucks, boats, road machinery, etc.

In other words, this is the capital investment not for the Indians but for the management of the agencies.

Mr. THATCHER: Are the telephone lines just for your own officials?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suppose some of the Indians might have telephones of their own also.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Why are they called Indian agencies if the people who live in them are no longer Indian agents?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is a problem in semantics that I have not addressed myself to yet.

Mr. MICHENER: This is the fund for the construction of residences of Indian agents?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. Some of the Indian agents of course are not in our buildings at all. I was in Cardston that weekend I was playing hookey from here, and the Indian agency is in the post office of the town. It is not on the reserve at all. The office is in a building a few hundred yards away from the reservation and the Indian agent or superintendent lives in a house in the village; we own the house.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): That does not apply to schools?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. This is just for the Indian agencies themselves and for what I might call the capital property of the reserve rather than property of the individual Indians.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a decrease there of $70,000 odd. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was just looking at it. There are a lot of items which have to be added up in both columns in order to see. Apparently there were not as many projects required this year as last.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Once you get your Indian agents into a building you do not build them every year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall that item carry?

Carried.

The next item is 73, "Reserves and trusts—operation and maintenance." The details are at page 154.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would it assist the committee if I gave a brief explanation?

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The reserves and trusts division is, in general, responsible for the management of Indian properties of all kinds. Specifically its responsibilities are:

(*a*) The management of the Indian trust fund and matters dealing with the expenditure of band funds, annuity payments and savings accounts.

(*b*) Band membership, Indian status, enfranchisements and commutations.

(*c*) Administration of Indian estates.

(*d*) Matters pertaining to titles, land registry, acquisition of lands for reserves, trespass, etc.

(*e*) Management of resources, sale and lease of reserve lands, sale of timber, minerals, oil and gas rights.

This vote provides for all expenditures required by the reserves and trusts division in carrying out its operations, including salaries of staff, forest surveys, funds for the acquisition of land, suppression and prevention of fires and other miscellaneous items.

The overall increase of $19,626 is mainly attributable to the provision of 11 new positions which include 7 in the estates section.

The estates division as I said the other day is not in good shape. We have not had enough lawyers, and we have not had enough assistance to complete the administration of these estates on a current basis and there have been problems of poor records, poor vital statistics, and other deficiencies which my predecessor tried to catch up with, and we have felt that we should try as far as possible to get competent people to come on our staff and get this backlog cleared up; but we have to pay civil service salaries and it is hard to get lawyers for those salaries.

Mr. THATCHER: Is this self sustaining?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would hardly think so.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you do that service for Indians completely free of charge?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Why would that be required? Is that in any particular treaty, or has it grown up by habit? Why would you not charge an Indian for looking after his estate the same as a white man has to?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Because he has only a small part of the original estate he had when we came here.

Mr. JONES: It has been the practice in the past for us to pay for the administration of Indian estates.

Mr. THATCHER: It was not one of their original treaty right?

Mr. JONES: No. I do not know whether you would call it, under the British North America Act, a responsibility on account of lands reserved for Indians. Of course the day may come when Indians will be expected to handle their own estates.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it correct that these estates are only the estates which are in the administered funds and not estates outside of the reserve funds?

Mr. JONES: No. On reserves.

Mr. MICHENER: So really what the department is trying to do is to determine who is entitled to the money which is deposited for a particular Indian?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. It would be very difficult for us not to administer it. Whether we should make a charge for administering it is another matter.

Mr. THATCHER: That was the point. There are some wealthy bands in Alberta, some with oil revenues, and I cannot see why the taxpayers should be paying out money to settle their accounts. There may be some poorer cases where that would not be so.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This is something that might very well be considered.

Mr. MICHENER: Where the estate runs into so many thousands of dollars there might be a tariff of fees.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think we could possibly do it where we still have estates which cannot be settled because the grandfather's estate has not been settled yet. What I am concerned about is to get this regrettable backlog disposed of as fast as I can, and I do not have much hope of getting it done rapidly.

Mr. MICHENER: That is what this staff of 7 is for?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): What is slowing up these things?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Once we get our backlog of these estates out of the way I think it will be a lot easier. All the members of the committee here who are lawyers will know that if a lawyer sets out to settle an estate as soon as possible after a person dies it can be done quickly, but with every month and year which passes new complications arise. Especially if some of the heirs begin to die the thing becomes that much more complicated; and, in some of these estates, there are poor records in the beginning.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Are your lawyers in the department looking into this thing now?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Some lawyers.

Mr. HENRY: You are imposing a duty on an outsider to give you necessary papers at certain times and you have difficulty in matters like that. However, the public trustee in a province looks after the insane and I think that what is done there would be a good precedent for you and yours in this problem.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL. We are giving the most earnest consideration to trying to speed this up, and I am going to ask the officials of the department to give consideration to Mr. Thatcher's suggestion, because I do not think there is any reason why the taxpayers should bear this burden for people who are really wealthy; but on the other hand I do not want the small Indian estates to be eaten up with charges which the Indians could never understand.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Mr. Minister, am I right in assuming that solicitors' salaries have been increased in the past two or three years, especially referring to grade 1?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would be very surprised if they had not been, otherwise we would have no solicitors.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: In 1951 a solicitor who had been in the service for 9 years was offered a position here and it was at $2,800. I understand at that time there was a backlog there. I was greatly surprised that the solicitors salaries would be so low. In fact, I think in this department the solicitor's salaries are lower than the others.

Mr. J. K. ABBOTT (*Chief, Personnel Division, Department of Citizenship and Immigration*): The salaries for solicitors in this branch are exactly the same as salary rates paid in other departments. The rates are established by the civil service commission.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Do you have trouble recruiting a man at that salary?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I know from my experience as Secretary of State that when we decided to increase the staff of the companies branch which was in arrears because we were not paying high enough salaries I found after I persuaded the commission to raise the salaries we still received practically no applicants.

Mr. BYRNE: If the average lawyer's income in this country is around $10,000 or the average income of lawyers—you can take it either way—perhaps the civil service commission should take a look at this and other professional categories to find out if they are sufficiently attractive.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the starting point for grade 1?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Grade 1 does not seem to be in the book. Grades 2 and 3 are. We have no grades 1 left now.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not in there, but perhaps Mr. Abbott would have it.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. Departmental solicitors, grade 1, begin at $3,720 and there are four annual increases which go up to a maximum salary rate of $4,620.

Mr. MICHENER: The last information I have about the trust fund is that it was in the neighbourhood of $22 million and that it had been taken entirely into the public funds of Canada for security purposes like so many other funds.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would you like me to give you an explanation on this?

Mr. MICHENER: In due course, but I have something to say about it myself. Interest is paid on it with respect to the first $1 million at 6 per cent per annum, and that on the rest of the fund, which would be about $21 million, probably more now, interest is paid to the Indians at 5 per cent per annum which considering the security seem to be a pretty exhorbitant rate of interest and must be justified on other grounds. The total interest paid by the government of Canada, which presumably comes into the treasury branch, will be in the neighbourhood of $1,116,000 a year. That is a circumvention of the Indians over and above all the facilities which are provided for by the Indian Affairs branch and by the Department of National Health which spends considerable money on their account. I have been making some rough calculations here about what it totals to and while I am not wishing at the moment to comment I would like to put them before the committee so that we can get into perspective the per capita payment to the Indians, assuming there are 150,000. The funds this year under Indian Affairs will be $134 each for 150,000 Indians, an expenditure of over $20 million. I got the figures last year from the Department of Health and Welfare of the per capita expenditure by that department for health of Indians of $107, and in addition to that I made a calculation about the circumvention that these interest rates involve which is something in the neighbourhood of $400,000 above the rates paid on other government securities. Family allowances are in the neighbourhood of $3 million, old age pensions in the neighbourhood of $2¼ million. Altogether it looks as though the government of Canada is appropriating $45 million for the benefit of Indians which comes to about $300 per capita. That is in comparison with the total appropriation of the country which is about $300 per capita. Expenditures for the whole of Canada include defence and other items, but in the case of Indians, the $300 is applied specifically toward the person and in addition they get whatever benefits every other citizen gets. It seems to me we have a pretty privileged group. I am not going to comment on this but I think the committee ought to understand exactly what we are doing in this respect.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think there is one defect in your arithmetic. You provide for the education of Indians, and if you take the per capita for all the other Canadians that does not include education at all which would be a very substantial addition. On the other hand your abstracted definition takes in a figure for defence and I suppose having taken the country away from the Indians it would be highly unfair to charge them for what the rest of us spend on defending it. To be quite serious about the matter there is no doubt at all that this quasi trust in which the Indians live is expensive. That is why I do not want to continue it one day longer than it needs to be continued.

Mr. STUART (*Charlotte*): How would the contribution made by this country per capita compare to the contribution made by the United States?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know, but I would be surprised if it was not substantially larger, though I have not seen the figures. It would probably take quite a while to build them up the way Mr. Michener has the Canadian figures.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not see the Indian population decreasing. With family allowances I would say the Indian population would increase very rapidly. I know that in some parts of the country the family allowance paid to an Indian family is sufficient to keep them in all the necessities of life, and they do not have to work as long as there are enough children within the family allowances bracket. The natural consequence is we are going to have an increased Indian population.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am not sure that it follows. I think the increase in the Indian population is because we keep the ones who are already born alive, not because of any rise in the birth rate.

Mr. MICHENER: It does bring up the necessity of the objective of integrating the Indian into Canadian society as ordinary Canadians so that he lives side by side with other Canadians just the same as the Maori does in New Zealand. It seems to me, now that the trend of population is turning, that your department should be particularly concerned about getting on with that job so that we have more Canadians and fewer Indians everywhere even though the Indian population does go up. It is a serious matter.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, the same views were expressed to me by my predecessor when I succeeded him. He said that this expenditure was a matter of the gravest concern to him and that he had tried from the time he first took over the department to overcome it just as rapidly as possible and to bring the Indians forward as fast as he possibly could to the point where these special expenditures for Indians as such might not be necessary at all. I think the committee knows I have the very highest regard for my predecessor, and I think the greatest work he did in the department was what he did in this branch. I think the progress which has been made in the four and a half years that he was minister compares very favourably with any progress which was ever made before in this field.

Mr. MICHENER: I think a fair conclusion without giving too much deliberate consideration to this would be that more expenditure now might mean less expenditure in the future.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I believe that. More expenditure if it is well and carefully planned but not indiscriminate expenditure—

Mr. MICHENER: —will product the results we require.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. That is why the big increase in expenditure appears in this item because we hope that a high proportion of these children who are educated will go out into the general Canadian community when they become adults and will cease to be Indians under the Indian Act.

Mr. THATCHER: When you put these Indians in residential schools is there any revenue whatever?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. We have the obligation to educate the Indians and we educate them free.

Mr. THATCHER: Is it a treaty obligation?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. THATCHER: You buy the textbooks for them and things of that kind?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. We treat them just the same as the ordinary children are treated in the province of Saskatchewan, probably a little better.

Mr. THATCHER: Yes, possibly better.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is the minister going to give us a story on those trust accounts?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Payment of interest on the trust fund was assumed by the government of Canada at Confederation and is included in a statutory item in "Finance Estimates". This appeared under an item reading "Interest on public debt-funded debt (including treasury bills)". In March each year the chief treasury officer servicing the Indian Affairs branch advises the finance department as to the amounts in the trust fund on which interest is payable at 5 and 6 per cent. Funds are transferred by finance out of the statutory "vote" referred to herein and cheques are issued by Indian affairs treasury as occasion necessitates.

There are three sums of money making up the trust fund:

(*a*) Capitalized annuities on which 6 per cent must be paid—$1,073,861.

This is a sum set aside many years prior to Confederation to guarantee payment of annuities to Indians not within treaty areas. The interest rate corresponds to the rate in effect at the time and is credited to band funds affected without relation to band membership.

(*b*) Capitalized annuities on which 5 per cent must be paid—$620,400. This is in much the same category as (a) except that the capital represents a fund to guarantee annuities payable to Indians of Ontario about the time of Confederation. Interest rate is also the rate payable at the time.

(*c*) The remainder of the trust fund, on which 5 per cent interest is paid in accordance with orders in council passed from time to time. The rates have varied as follows:

Date	*Rate*	*Effective*
January 1, 1883	4 per cent	January 1, 1883
September 29, 1892	3½ per cent	July 1, 1892
January 1, 1898	3 per cent	January 1, 1898
June 5, 1917	5 per cent	April 1, 1917

Approximate sources of Indian trust fund revenue in 1953-54

Government Interest	22 per cent	Oil Royalties	10 per cent
Other Royalties and Rentals	25 per cent	Land Sales	9 per cent
Timber dues	11 per cent	Repayments of band loans	2 per cent
Savings Deposits	5 per cent	Miscellaneous	16 per cent

Mr. MONTEITH: In the public accounts of 1953-54 there are two separate divisions to the Indian trust funds; one capital accounts and the other revenue accounts? Just what is the interpretation as to the difference of these two accounts? How do you determine what goes in one and what in the other?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think perhaps Mr. Brennan can explain that. It is much too complicated for me.

Mr. JONES: It is really the difference between capital and revenue. The interest paid by the government, for instance, goes into the revenue account. The capital account is much harder to spend. It is much more protected.

Mr. MONTEITH: Out of the capital account there is cash distribution on timber dues and enfranchisement, repairs and construction on band property, construction of Indian houses and then a miscellaneous item of 238,857. This is actually back in 1953-1954. Also, I notice in the revenue account there is distribution of $560,000, for relief, hospital and medical fees. How do you determine what money goes out from the trust accounts for this purpose and what items are paid out of the welfare of Indians items?

Mr. JONES: We feel that in a band that has sufficient revenue from their band funds that the first charge against that should be their own relief. Where bands have not sufficient funds of their own then we pay for relief out of appropriation. In some cases—I am speaking now of a department not our own,

the Department of National Health and Welfare—Indian health services are moving towards the same program as far as medical services are concerned of asking the wealthy bands to subscribe for the health of Indians; that would be excluding tuberculosis and mental health.

Mr. MONTEITH: Also in your disbursements of the trust accounts is a miscellaneous item of $816,000 odd.

Mr. JONES: That is really under the welfare division which we will be coming to.

Mr. MONTEITH: This is money spent out of trust accounts. I am wondering what the fur project is?

Mr. JONES: I should have the answer to that if you will give me a minute. I am sorry.

The Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is two years ago, of course.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am assuming the same thing would be listed up to date in the present accounts.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there any policy to build up the fund or is it the policy to distribute all the income each year keeping the capital?

Mr. JONES: The indication of the budget is that it will all pretty well be spent.

Mr. MICHENER: Income is being spent and some of the capital?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: All control is given to the Indian bands themselves over the projects for which this money will be spent?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They make up a budget of their own and submit it to the department and the minister has a veto. There is no restriction on what they can propose but if the department recommend to me and if I agree with their recommendation that it is an imprudent expenditure I can disallow it. But I cannot, except by exhortation, get them to spend any money. They alone can propose expenditures.

Mr. MICHENER: Your judgment is the same as the Senate in that respect.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Very much.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Purely destructive.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: My attention has been directed to section 64 of the Act, which says:

> With the consent of the council of a band, the minister may authorize and direct the expenditure of capital moneys of the band
>
> (*a*) to distribute per capita to the members of the band an amount not exceeding fifty per cent of the capital moneys of the band derived from the sale of surrendered lands,
>
> (*b*) to construct and maintain roads, bridges, ditches and water courses on the reserves or on surrendered lands,
>
> (*c*) to construct and maintain outer boundary fences on reserves,
>
> (*d*) to purchase land for use by the band as a reserve or as an addition to a reserve,
>
> (*e*) to purchase for the band the interest of a member of the band in lands on a reserve,

(*f*) to purchase livestock and farm implements, farm equipment, or machinery for the band,

(*g*) to construct and maintain on or in connection with a reserve such permanent improvements or works as in the opinion of the minister will be of permanent value to the band or will constitute a capital investment,

(*h*) to make to members of the band, for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the band, loans not exceeding one-half of the total value of

(i) the chattels owned by the borrower, and

(ii) the land with respect to which he holds or is eligible to receive a certificate of possession,

and may charge interest and take security therefor,

(*i*) to meet expenses necessarily incidental to the management of lands on a reserve, surrendered lands and any band property, and

(*j*) for any other purpose that in the opinion of the minister is for the benefit of the band.

Mr. FULTON: May I ask this: the complaint from the Indians in my constituency is that they have asked for the expenditure of some of their band funds for the benefit of housing on the reserve. Is there any policy being followed with respect to the expenditure of money for that purpose? I am told that they recommended it and that is has been disallowed.

Mr. JONES: There is a bit of a technicality in connection with the loaning of money from the capital fund for housing. It is a bit involved and we are at present trying to straighten it out. It is not a question of turning them down, because we have had many bands in the last few years who have used their band fund for housing. We consider it one of the worthwhile ways of spending money, but at the present time there seems to be a slight legal technicality about the use of capital funds for loaning to an individual.

Mr. FULTON: If the band recommends it, would there be any power to spend the money not as a loan but simply on the construction of housing which the band itself might administer?

Mr. JONES: No, because as you will appreciate it the funds are communal and we have to make sure that any monies expended from them are for the benefit of the entire band.

Mr. FULTON: I am thinking of the situation of the band council which meets to approve the spending of band funds for, let us say, "x"; the band council passed on that, and I am told there is a recommendation of that sort.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: You mean where a house would be given to the person?

Mr. FULTON: Or designated for his occupancy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But he would not pay any rent for it?

Mr. FULTON: That is my understanding; it would be on reserve property and he would not have any power to dispose of it.

Mr. JONES: You are getting close to the problem which is bothering us, practically giving band money to the benefit of one person.

Mr. FULTON: Would the objection be met if the band should say "we will merely regard it as band property and we will decide who lives on it, and upon his death, or if his family have disbanded, we will designate it for the use of somebody else?"

Mr. JONES: If the band retains complete control over it, there is no legal obstacle. Where we have the greatest success is where the whole community is engaged in the practical building of a whole series of houses so that everybody will benefit; and that has happened in quite a few places.

Mr. FULTON: Your legal difficulty is where the band wants to spend money for the use of an individual and to allow that individual to have the disposal of the house.

Mr. JONES: That appears to be the difficulty at the present time.

Mr. FULTON: It is not always easy to explain things absolutely clearly to Indians, and I do not want to give them a wrong impression. Is it your impression that I could go back to the band and say to the band that they should work along the line of a community housing project, and that the council itself should retain the control?

Mr. FORTIER: That is something which is under consideration right now, how we could do it.

Mr. FULTON: The department is working on it?

Mr. FORTIER: If I understand you correctly, you are asking about a loan to an individual to build a house.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No. Mr. Fulton suggests that the band should build and own the houses just as a municipality might own a municipal housing project, and let those houses to individual Indians while the band retains control of them. Is that right?

Mr. FULTON: Would that get us over the legal difficulty?

Mr. JONES: Up in the Saugeen Reserve, monies were made available from their own band funds, and they went into a housing project to build modern homes with electricity, bathrooms, and everything else. But the council retained title to them, and the money is being repaid to the band fund through their interest distribution; they have all voluntarily waived their annual interest distribution, so that it will be repaid into the capital account. It was a sort of community project under which everybody would benefit.

Mr. FULTON: Is it a requirement of the project that the capital fund be reimbursed, or would a recommendation from the council of the band that the band capital be spent without it being reimbursed—would that be capable of acceptance as a plan for housing?

Mr. FORTIER: You mean a resolution passed by the band whether or not they would repay the money?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not think you have caught Mr. Fulton's question. He says: "would we allow that to be done?" He is not asking what would happen if the Indians said they wanted to build a housing project in this particular way without providing for repayment to the band fund, but just as a continuing capital investment.

Mr. FORTIER: That would depend as to the funds, the capital funds of the band, and whether or not it would be advantageous, or possible with the fund which the band owns, their capital fund.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In the final analysis, I suppose I would have to make up my mind whether or not it was a prudent expenditure.

Mr. FULTON: I appreciate that, but I wonder whether that approach would meet with a legal obstacle, or whether it would be merely a matter of decision whether it was a wise expenditure.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The director seems to agree that there would be no legal obstacles unless I presented a legal obstacle; but there is no obstacle under the technicalities of the law.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we go now to item 73.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
73	Operation and Maintenance....	154	257,676	238,050	19,626	

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice that travelling in connection with the operation of the reserves has increased from $10 thousand to $22 thousand. Why would that be?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I probably have an explanation of that. I always like to see these travelling estimates myself because I know that they interest some people more than other expenditures. It provides for travelling expenses of the various divisions required to travel in connection with the administration of the reserves and surrendered lands and band funds; and there was an increase of $12 thousand. It is attributed entirely to the work of the estates section, in clearing up a backlog of estates estimated to be in excess of eight thousand.

The CHAIRMAN: Eight thousand estates?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. I know that is not a pretty picture.

The CHAIRMAN: You are not increasing the number of your solicitors who are the ones who have to do that work. There are eight thousand estates to be cleared up and you have only four solicitors working on it?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps the director might say a word as to that.

Mr. JONES: The estates section is being increased by a considerable amount of personnel. We feel that there is a lot of leg work that can be done by non-legal people and we have set up these positions known as estate clerks. They are going to do a lot of research with respect to those reserves. It does not require a lawyer. We will have four lawyers, but they will be devoting themselves to more complicated problems. On the other hand, leg work done by eleven estate clerks can produce a lot of dockets which will make for ease in cleaning up the estates. That is the way we are approaching it now.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Mr. MONTEITH: Did you find out, Colonel Jones, what that fur object was?

Mr. JONES: I have been thinking of it ever since but I still have not got a note of it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps by 3:30 you will be able to give an answer.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall deal with it under administration.

Mr. MICHENER: I notice there is a reduction with respect to your firefighters, for which the amount is down from $12 thousand to $6 thousand. Was your experience pretty good in fighting fires?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am told that the expenditures have been held to 50 per cent of the amount voted over the past few years, so we have cut it down in order to save somebody from accusing us of padding. I am told that the Indian bands which have any money are expected to provide for their own firefighting.

Mr. JONES: It comes out of their capital account.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Carried.

We shall carry on with the item, welfare of Indians at 3:30.

Mr. MONTEITH: We did not get notice of the 3:30 meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I gave notice yesterday that we would meet in room 497. We will be adjourning at 4:45 so that we can attend the meeting with Mr. Dulles.

The meeting adjourned.

AFTERNOON SITTING

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could start off with the answers to some questions. First of all there is the question which was asked in regard to the public accounts of 1953-54.

Mr. H. M. JONES: In the public accounts for the period ending March 31, 1954, the miscellaneous item under trust accounts, which includes fur projects, show total receipts of $779,834 and disbursements of $816,041. Of this amount receipts totalling $244,359.04 and disbursements totalling $236,181.51 were the revenue and expenditures from fur projects where the furs are marketed on behalf of Indians and the proceeds distributed to them.

These are not trust in the ordinary sense of the word, but are actually non-interest bearing deposit accounts in which the monies are held between the date of their receipt from the marketing agency and their distribution to the Indians concerned.

Does that answer your question, Mr. Monteith?

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think there is another outstanding question on Immigration which we could perhaps put on the record now. This was the question of medical examinations which Mr. Fulton mentioned the other day.

Mr. Laval FORTIER, (*Deputy Minister, Department of Citizenship and Immigration*): We obtained these figures from the Department of National Health and Welfare. The total number of examinations during the fiscal year 1953-54 abroad was 225,019. Those who were certified "A" 408, certified "B" 3,192, certified "C" 19,113, certified "I" 8. During the fiscal year 1954-55 up to the 31st of January, 1955, the total number of examinations was 126,840. Certified "A" 314, certified "B" 1,588, certified "C" 11,230, certified "I" 5, making a total of 13,137.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Perhaps the deputy minister should explain what each one of these categories means.

Mr. FORTIER: These certifications refer to section 5 of the Immigration Act. Under "A" those are mostly mental cases. Under "B" they would be tubercular, trachoma, or other contagious diseases. Under "C" it would be physical defects in which if the settlement arrangements in Canada are satisfactory the person would be allowed to come in. "I" would be those persons who were chronic alcoholics.

The CHAIRMAN: How many of them were there?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: 8 one year and five the next. I thought when I gave my undertaking to Mr. Fulton the other day that I could easily separate the curabels from the incurabels, but there is no such segretation in the departmental statistics.

Mr. FULTON: Did the deputy minister say that these are those who are admitted in spite of these findings?

Mr. FORTIER: That is the certification made by medical officers abroad of the people they examined.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is rather interesting that out of 225,000 examinations made in 1953-54 there were about 22,000 medical and physical rejections, which is 10 per cent out 225,000. Up to the 31st January, 1955, for this fiscal year, out of this 126,000 odd there were 131. The proportion seems to be almost exactly the same.

Mr. FULTON: Just over 10 per cent in each case.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Are these examinations made by departmental doctors or by local doctors engaged on the spot or both.

Mr. FORTIER: In all immigration offices on continental Europe these would be examinations by Canadians doctors. In the United Kingdom some of those would be made by Canadian doctors, others by roster doctors. Of course, in other parts of the world there would be some doctors who are not Canadian.

Mr. MICHENER: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we are on "Welfare of Indians" the first item 74, "Operation and maintenance".

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would it be of any advantage to the committee if I indicated there what the scope of this vote 74 is.

This vote is to provide funds required for the administration of the welfare and for relief assistance, social services and economic assistance required for the welfare of the Indian population in Canada, a population which is increasing at the rate of approximately 2,000 persons annually. It includes the salaries and travelling expenses of the staff of the welfare division at Ottawa and 8 social workers in the field; the purchase of food, clothing and fuel for sick, blind and indigent Indians as well as maintenance and care of helpless Indians. Provision is made for the repairing of houses occupied by Indians and assistance to Indian farmers who otherwise would be unable to obtain seed and other agricultural requirements. Provision is made for the cost of special rehabilitation rations for tuberculous Indians.

Mr. MICHENER: Would you let us have the details about the 9 social workers and whether there are any Indians among them and so on?

Mr. JONES: We have a supervisor of social workers at our head office in Ottawa.

Mr. MICHENER: That would be the first on the list, grade 4?

Mr. JONES: Yes. And one for each of our units in the field which roughly correspond to provinces. One in Vancouver; one in Alberta; Regina; Manitoba; North Bay, for northern Ontario; 1 in Toronto for our southern Ontario headquarters; one in Quebec; one in Amherst, Nova Scotia who looks after the Maritime provinces. All our qualifications are set pretty well by the civil service commission in line with professional requirements of other departments, namely the Department of Health and Welfare and the Department of Veterans Affairs. We try, and have been very successful, to have graduates from schools of social work.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there any Indians among the social workers?

Mr. JONES: Not as yet.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the number of Indians who go on to higher studies in the universities?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Could we hold that question over until we get to the educational item.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the tables of tubercular patients there is an increase of some $200,000. Does that mean that more Indians are being rehabilitated all the time?

Mr. JONES: It would appear that the peak has been reached in the treatment of tubercular Indians. It took a long time for the X-ray survey teams to cover the entire Indian population, particularly in the far north. The X-ray survey was able, in their operations, to detect all signs of tuberculosis particularly in its early stages. For that reason and for the reasons that we broadened this last year to make it more comprehensive, there is a big increase indicated, but we do feel that we are pretty well at the peak of treatment, not only the patient before he goes into hospital, but every contact there might have been in the family.

Mr. MICHENER: This rehabilitation ration is interesting and they are using this system of treating tubercular patients in other departments.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The rehabilitation ration provides food for patients who are admitted to hospital and to other members of the family approximately six months after the patient is admitted and to the ex-patient and the family for approximately six months after the patient is discharged. The real purpose is to try to prevent relapses after the Department of Health has gone to the very considerable expense of getting these people cured.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Have you any evidence as to the extent to which we have been able to reduce the incidence of tuberculosis among Indians?

Mr. JONES: In the calendar year 1953 3,007 tubercular Indians were admitted to sanitaria and 2,170 were discharged. The total patient strength at present is approximately 3,500. It is believed the crest has been reached, and that in the next few years the number of cases requiring treatment will diminish. The tuberculosis death rate among Indians has been reduced by approximately 70 per cent during the past ten years. The case rate has not as yet decreased. It is following the pattern, I understand, of tuberculosis among non-Indians.

Mr. MICHENER: Can the committee be told what are the principal areas in which tuberculosis is found among Indians. I know the James bay area has been a bad section, with approximately 3,300 to 3,500 Indians on the bay. Perhaps we could get at this information by studying the areas in which this item—the food item we have here—is spent.

Mr. JONES: Well, I think you can take it that it is right across the trapping area for a certainty, from Abitibi through the Patricia district and the top half of the prairie provinces.

Mr. MICHENER: The northern part of Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. JONES: Yes, in the northern areas such as the Abitibi and Sioux Lookout Agencies.

Mr. MICHENER: What about the southern part of Labrador?

Mr. JONES: It is lower there, but I think it is still higher than in the surrounding areas. I think the largest incidence is in the fringe areas of the north.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it your view that the disease is being conquered among the Indians?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We are over the crest, perhaps, I am told. As a matter of fact I was interested in another aspect of this entirely. As you know an agreement was made between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland last year to do something for the Indians and Eskimos in Labrador, and as members of the committee know, the Indians of Labrador are not Indians under the Act, and I was told at that time that so often we

send these people to hospital and they get treatment and the disease is arrested, but then they go back to live in the same conditions as before, and it is not very long before they are infected again, and that is the real purpose of this vote, to try to ensure against that kind of loss.

Mr. JUTRAS: The minister seemed to make a statement that the Eskimos of Labrador were not Indians.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, I said the Indians—I was rather mumbling there—that the Indians of Labrador were not Indians under the Act. The Indians there are regarded as ordinary citizens.

Mr. BYRNE: Is trachoma been more or less wiped out?

Mr. JONES: I do not think I am competent to answer that question. There is a certain amount of it.

Mr. BYRNE: That is among the western Indians?

Mr. JONES: It seems to be more prevalent among the northern Indians—among the trapping Indians generally.

Mr. BYRNE: What is this item here with regard to free travel for Indians? Is that for conventions and so on?

	1955-56	*1954-55*
Travel of Indians	$12,000	$7,500

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This has nothing to do with junkets or conventions. It provides funds for assisting destitute Indians who have become stranded to return to their reserves. It is the policy of the department to encourage Indians to seek employment away from their reserves when gainful employment on the reserves is not available. This policy is followed in the belief that gainful employment is better than direct relief and less costly to the taxpayer, even when it is necessary to provide transportation costs to return Indians to their reserves when employment terminates.

Every effort is made to have the Indians pay their expenses for returning to reserves, but it often happens that after they are laid off one job they remain seeking other employment and use up the money they had earned.

The increase of $4,500 is due to the increasing number of Indians who are employed off the reserves. We were getting more of them to go out and take employment for a season, and it may be there was a greater proportion of them, or rather a greater total, who were stranded, which would account for the increase.

Mr. MONTEITH: It is a wise and prudent policy.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is no padding here. I am told we are running short.

Mr. MONTEITH: I noticed on page 155 an item of $1,936,950, against which the estimated expenditure is $2,426,950, that is, a deficit of $490,000, by which sum it is estimated the item will be short. That, I am assuming, calls for a supplementary vote.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well, I hope you will vote for it next week, Mr. Monteith.

Mr. CAMERON (*High Park*): I was wondering if the hon. minister could give us some information about the arrangement, whether official or unofficial, with regard to border crossings by Indians.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think the deputy minister might answer that. I have received representations on that subject once or twice from Mr. Paul, who is a fellow provincial of yourself and Mr. Fulton.

Mr. FORTIER: As far as I can recollect, under the United States Immigration Act there is a provision which makes North American Indians free to

travel between Canada and the United States. In Canada we do not have that provision in the Immigration Act. The Indians from the United States are admissible in the same way as any other visitors from the United States.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are treated as citizens of the United States.

Mr. CAMERON: In once instance I know of a young Indian who was in the habit of going across quite often and he went over on one occasion but was called up into the American army. He did not object to it, because he thought it would be a useful experience, but I was wondering if that could happen to a Canadian Indian who might not wish to be called up into the American army?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think you had better ask in the External Affairs committee about that, or put the question to Mr. Pearson. I would not like to answer it myself.

Mr. CAMERON: I will ask Mr. Dulles.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the significance of the increase in the second last item with respect to care of indigent Indians which rises from $85,000 to $140,000?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am told the increase is due to increased services on account of improved social welfare coverage. Apparently we are looking after more people. We did not formerly have the facilities for looking after them. More cases of neglected children are being discovered by welfare workers. That may be because there are more welfare workers. I hope it is not because the number of neglected children is increasing. Of course, it may be that the number of children is increasing.

Mr. MICHENER: Conceivably there might be more Indians. Is this required at the present time or anticipated because of a lack of employment generally?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is no suggestion of that here. $40,000 is due to two items not previously included in this vote. This would seem to be for the maintenance of juveniles in reform institutions and compensation to children's aid societies. That is $40,000 of the $55,000 increase. So the other increase is not very substantial.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Carried.

Item 75, "Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and New Equipment, $1,022,865". The particulars appear on page 156.

Mr. MICHENER: Would the minister explain this item?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: This vote provides funds for the welfare construction program, which includes the construction of 668 houses for Indians, the sinking of wells, the clearing of land for agricultural purposes, logging and sawmill operations, and miscellaneous items. The vote also provides funds for the purchase of livestock which, I understand, are mainly pedigreed bulls; farming machinery, fishing boats; and other equipment designed to improve the living standards of the Indians.

Mr. THATCHER: Do they pay us back for the houses which we build?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the director had better explain this housing.

Mr. JONES: We ask the Indian to contribute to the utmost of his ability when a home is erected. In some cases all he can contribute is the labour. Sometimes he can pick out the logs for the side walls, and we will help with the roof. Of course, the houses vary from the southern part of the country, where they are more modern, to a very modest home in the north. Indians are expected to, and do to the best of their ability, provide what funds or labour or material they can.

Mr. THATCHER: If you advance them money to build a home, do they have to pay it back over a period of time?

Mr. JONES: Not under this vote. This is to assist them to build houses.

Mr. THATCHER: Why would the taxpayers of Canada build houses for Indians when we do not do it for ordinary citizens? I do not follow the reasoning in that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There are two types of housing, as I see it, Mr. Thatcher. There is the housing provided by loans under the band funds.

Mr. THATCHER: I am all for that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: But there are also other Indians who are very poor. Again I use these analogies with trepidation, because I shall no doubt receive letters complaining about them. But this, if you like, is approaching the meeting of the housing problem of nearly destitute people. Part of it is comparable to a slum clearance project. We think that probably if these people are housed a little better and placed in better surroundings they are less likely to contract TB and other illnesses, and it may improve their morale and their earning power in the long run.

Mr. HELLYER: Is Mr. Thatcher opposed to subsidized housing?

Mr. THATCHER: This is entirely different. This is an outright gift. There are some Indians who are too lazy to work. If these houses are being built for that type of citizen, I do not see why we should pay this. If an Indian is living in destitute conditions, I think we should build a house for him, but let him pay the money back over the years or let his band pay it out of their funds. I should like to know if any of those houses are being built in Alberta, where some of the Indians have oil wells.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can assure you that we do not spend public funds on Indians who have funds to spend themselves.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I myself have visited one of those projects which we were discussing. It is in a very poor section, some 20 miles by C.N.R. east of Gogama, in the bush. I have visited the project in question, where there are some 20 houses that have been built. They are very good cottages, much better than these Indians ever lived in before. There is also a school that has been built and a community hall which they use for concerts and so on. I was amazed at the school principal in charge there, who is from the department. He is a teacher who was sent there from Brockville, a very smart young man. I was amazed at the contribution that he got from the Indians themselves. You were talking about the lazy Indians. They have been there for 180 years. They have never had any market, and they have been living directly on trapping and fishing. I can assure you that they are certainly doing something to rehabilitate the Indians in general, not only from the point of view of health but from that of morale and from all points of view. The magistrate, whom I met on the train, told me the same thing, and the welfare workers have told me the same thing. As long as we do not overdo it and begin to build houses for those oil men that you have in Alberta, I can assure you that those they have built in that part of the country were badly needed, and very good work has been done there.

Mr. THATCHER: I should like to make it clear that I think it is fine to build these houses if you are going to try to make the Indian pay it back over a period of years, like any other citizen, but for the life of me I cannot understand why we build homes for Indians—I do not care how destitute they are—unless we try to get some of the money back.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We get a good deal of it in their own labour, to begin with. Some of these Indians live in places where, if you put a debt on them, all you would be doing is creating a lot of bookkeeping for civil

servants here in Ottawa, and it would be a sheer waste. I think that I can illustrate this best with figures. The average departmental contribution is estimated at $1,317 per house. That is not $13,000 per house, but $1,317 per house.

Mr. HELLYER: I thought that the party to which Mr. Thatcher belongs—

Mr. THATCHER: Do not interpret policy for my party.

Mr. HELLYER: —approved of anything that could be done to improve housing accommodation for people generally. This subsidy does that.

Mr. THATCHER: It is not a subsidy. It is a gift.

Mr. HELLYER: What is the difference between a subsidy and a gift?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: A rose by another name.

Mr. CAMERON *(Nanaimo)*: Since the party to which Mr. Thatcher belongs unfortunately has been mentioned, I should like to dissociate myself entirely from his remarks. I should like to make it perfectly clear as to the policy—and I think that I speak for the majority—

Mr. FULTON: You have no majority.

Mr. CAMERON *(Nanaimo)*: We do not consider that payments of this sort to Indians should be considered solely on the basis of ordinary business arrangements. I think that we at least do accept this position that, as the invaders of this country, if you will, a new race which has brought a new culture here, we have a responsibility to the indigenous population to try to help them to adjust themselves in the modern world, no matter how much it costs us, and to apply the ridiculous yard stick that we apply to our own cultural ammenities is shear nonsense besides being wholly unjust.

The CHAIRMAN: You can put that in your pipe and smoke it, Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. THATCHER: I still think that the reasoning of my colleague is worse than that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think myself that I can say with respect to the position of the government in this matter, that I do not think it differs very much from the position of most of the hundred and fifty private members of parliament who support the government and the minister; and it is that we do not think that we should spend money to encourage idleness or to encourage lack of thrift in the Indians. We are trying to do the exact reverse.

I think there is a great deal of difference—as Mr. Gauthier brought out so well—in putting these people in very modest surroundings where they have a chance to live the kind of lives they will have to live if they are going to adapt themselves to our modern society.

Mr. THATCHER: They should pay it back gradually over a period of time.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Those who can, do.

Mr. HELLYER: This subsidy is not as great as the subsidy in some of the other public housing projects, such as the one at Regent's Park in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I did not mention that, but it was in the back of my mind.

Mr. GAUTHIER *(Nickle Belt)*: I want to make it clear that to a lot of people on this committee it might seem that $13 hundred for a house is a pretty low cost.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the average departmental contribution to it.

Mr. GAUTHIER *(Nickel Belt)*: I want to follow that up by explaining what contributes to keeping that cost at a low figure. Not only is the department doing some of this, but their work has aroused the importance of it among many people. I know that all the material for the houses for these Indians

was taken in by the Department of Lands and Forests of Ontario. They contributed largely with their trucks and bulldozers in order to take in that material and in order to build trails by which to get these houses built; and naturally if a housing project was to be started anywhere else you would have to add all those costs to it. They have done everything possible; and these were people who were not directly responsible for the Indians. They did everything they could to help the Department of Indian Affairs in bringing in materials in order to make the project possible.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I echo what you said. This is certainly one matter about which I have great pleasure to echo what Mr. Gauthier said.

Mr. CANNON: To summarize what Mr. Thatcher has said: If the Indians were to be dealt with like other citizens of our country, it would not be necessary to have an Indian Act, or an Indian Affairs branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, quite.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Item 76 "Grants to Agricultural Exhibitions and Indian Fairs."

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
76	Grants to Agricultural Exhibitions and Indian Fairs.....	156	7,350	7,350		

Mr. MONTEITH: This is a very small item and I am all in favour of grants to assist Indians fairs, agricultural exhibitions and that sort of thing; but it does seem rather odd that this item in the estimates has stuck around $7,450 in 1953; $7,350 in both 1954, 1955, and again this year. That amount has never been spent; and I notice in the details there are amounts actually set out totalling $7,350 that apparently had geen put in, but some of them are never paid; and it would appear that there has always been a surplus of over $1 thousand odd.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact if there is not a fair in a particular place—and that sometimes happens—then it is not paid; and there is a certain amount of this for according prizes for garden and crop competitions. It just depends on how many prizes are awarded.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is the forecast?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The forecast of expenditure is $6,350 for this year; and that is $1 thousand less than we have had to spend, and we will spend it if we have the things to spend it on.

Mr. MONTEITH: It looks like another $1 thousand of padding.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Well yes, maybe it is.

Mr. MCLEOD: Under that item I see no grant was made to the provincial exhibition in British Columbia. What is the idea for that? What happens to be the meaning?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It was not on your account, I can assure you, Mr. McLeod. I am ashamed to say I do not know anything about the Okanagan exhibition myself. But the grant has been deleted because the Indians in that area have not, in the last two years, participated. Of course these grants are given solely because of the participation of the Indians.

Mr. MCLEOD: That is a fair which serves quite a large centre of Indian population.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will make a deal with you. If you will get the Indians to participate actively this year I will recommend a grant next year.

Mr. MCLEOD: I will put in an appeal with that end in view.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Carried.

The next item is item 77, "Fur conservation".

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
77	Fur Conservation.....	157	332,155	318,030	14,125	

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would the committee like to have an explanation of this? If so let me read:

> The purpose of this vote is to promote the stabilization of the Indian economy by management, in co-operation with the various provinces, of the fur and wildlife resources available to Indians, both on and off their reserves, including assistance in marketing and management of the proceeds therefrom.
>
> Provides for:—
>
> (1) Salaries of staff and wages of Indian tallymen, guides and office assistance for fur supervisors.
> (2) Supplies, materials and equipment, including acquisition of traplines.
> (3) Payment of trapline registration fees for Indians.
> (4) Transfer of fur-bearing animals to depleted areas.
> (5) Control of predators.
> (6) Construction and maintenance of water control structures.
> (7) Proportionate sharing of cost of programs with Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario up to an amount fixed by agreement with those provinces.
>
> Almost half the Indians of Canada live in areas where the only resource available to them is wildlife. Alternative sources of livelihood are being sought and developed, but trapping is, and will be for some time to come, their main occupation.
>
> Through the development program made possible by this vote, large areas have been brought from virtual depletion into sustained yield production.

And that reminds me that I was not quite happy when I was looking this morning at some of the things I was supposed to have said at yesterday's meeting. I think Mr. Hellyer trapped me into making a very silly observation

that except for a few muskrats in Manitoba we had done nothing to improve the fur resources. But we have in fact done a great deal. I knew it, but I could not resist a chance to make a wise crack.

Mr. HELLYER: I am an old trapper from away back, but it was not deliberate.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Hellyer and I come from a part of the country where the stimulation of muskrats has been going on for a long time.

Mr. HELLYER: Yes, and they are of excellent quality too; they are the Rice Lake rats.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL:

> Natural increases have been greatly accelerated by the transfer of over 6,000 live beavers with the funds provided. The increased production of fur-bearing animals has, in developed areas, more than offset the recent decline in raw fur prices. For example, the total production of the three province (that is Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario) assisted by agreement, which stood at 31,900 pelts when the agreements were signed, has risen to 179,000 pelts in 1954 with still further increases in sight. Muskrat rehabilitation areas developed in co-operation with the province of Manitoba at a cost to the federal treasury of $289,000 have returned to trappers, about half of whom are Indians, over $3,000,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this arrangement in effect with all the provinces?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Those three provinces which I mentioned, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario.

Mr. FULTON: Is this vote confined to them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think certain things are done on our own in other areas, but it is only with these three provinces that we have this particular arrangement.

Mr. MICHENER: What are the duties of the fur supervisors? Are they graders or classifiers of furs?

Mr. JONES: We have a general supervisor at head office and fur supervisors throughout the province, who with the provincial authorities in particular in conservation areas advise the Indians along educational lines in the conservation of wildlife generally. They have certain rights to hunting and fishing at all times of the year, but there is an educational program going on conducted by the fur supervisors in the matter of conservation and they work closely with the provincial people in the provinces on the development of this program.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): That applies only to reserves?

Mr. JONES: Not necessarily. Trapping areas.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): The trap lines outside the reserves are administered by the province of Ontario?

Mr. JONES: Yes. Most of these are on provincial lands.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it there is a certain amount of travelling involved?

Mr. JONES: Yes. They are on the go all the time.

Mr. MICHENER: Do they have to travel by air?

Mr. JONES: A good deal of the time, and by dog and by snowmobile.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the payment of trapline registration fees which the government has to make? Is that the payment of fees on behalf of Indians?

Mr. JONES: On behalf of indigent Indians.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Trapline registration fees, $12,300. It is the second item below the salary items.

Mr. JONES: The big item there is an item of $9,500 for Alberta and the explanation for that is in the absence of any fur development agreement with Alberta respecting hunting and trapping rights of Indians it has been agreed that the department will pay registration fees for Indians. The other provinces are all small. It is where we protect the rights of an Indian to a registered trapline and also to hold them until that trapline becomes productive.

Mr. MICHENER: Do you make a practice of endeavouring to recover any of that money expended from the furs?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not see any item of revenue in this fur conservation item.

Mr. JONES: Yes. We have an item in the revenue of $570.

Mr. MICHENER: It does not show in the book.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It does not seem to be very productive of revenue.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, I would think on these traplines that are being restocked there would be no return.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is not very much. This is one of the gravest problems. I am engaged at the moment in negotiations with the Minister of National Defence who has taken up a great area at Cold Lake Alberta for military purposes. It is a good trapping area and all those traplines are gone. There is just no place to replace them. It has created a very grave economic problem for the department concerning the Indians in the area.

Mr. HELLYER: They are using the land for some purpose that it would be no longer available for trapping?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, for bombing. The Minister of National Defence thought we had some exalted ideas about what compensation the Indians should get and I said we are always ready to call the deal off, that we would rather have the traplines than any compensation. But the deal has not been called off.

Mr. FULTON: How many Indians would be affected by the Cold Lake scheme?

Mr. JONES: Roughly 2,000.

Mr. FULTON: A big proportion of the Indian population in Alberta.

Mr. JONES: Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is right on the border.

Mr. MICHENER: The rehabilitation of some of these trap lines has been very satisfactory. Some of the Indians up on the bay whom I know are making, in good fur years, six or seven thousand dollars out of beaver, simply because beaver have been restored I think through the joint efforts of the provincial and federal governments and the Indians are learning to limit their take—they are beginning to get conservation minded—with the restult that each family has a definite area and takes its limit, and they are all prosperous.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: The trouble is that when you get too many beaver pelts the price goes down.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried?

Carried.

Item 78. Administration, operation and maintenance.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
78	Education— Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	158	8,521,245	7,401,323	1,119,922	

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I don't think I will give any special explanation of this. We had a long discussion about it yesterday.

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice here that the total estimates for this item in 1955 were $7,401,323, and the total estimated expenditure is $7,781,323 which leaves a deficit of $380 thousand. I am assuming there will be a supplementary vote on that?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There will be.

Mr. MICHENER: This is a very big and substantial item, but I am sure everybody agrees that this is the major work of the department. Some 8½ million dollars, if it does the job, and leads to the education of Indian children, will be usefully employed in this service.

Mr. BYRNE: Has the per capita payment been raised recently for children attending residential schools?

Mr. FORTIER: The per capita payment varies from one school to another.

Mr. DAVEY: It varies from $295.96 in the lowest case to $620.08 in one case where the rate is abnormally high.

Mr. BYRNE: That is for each student for a year?

Mr. DAVEY: Yes. It varies with the location of each school and with the size of the school. Some of these very small schools cannot operate at as low a cost as the larger schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one question which Mr. Michener asked.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes. That was the number of Indians at universities.

Mr. DAVEY: I have the figures here for 1954. In first year university and grade 13, which is accepted by most universities as an equivalent of first year university, 11; second year university, 8; third year, 1; fourth year, 1; making a total of 21. In normal schools last year there were 9; taking nursing training 28; commercial courses 47; and trade course 38. I have not the break down of figures for 1955 for universities, but I have it for the other four categories if you would like them.

Mr. CANNON: Up to what grade do the Indian schools go?

Mr. DAVEY: We have some which go up to grade 12. We try to avoid the establishment of Indian high schools. We prefer to board pupils where they can attend non-Indian schools.

Mr. CANNON: On the average, what grade do your schools go up to?

Mr. DAVEY: On an average the Indian schools we operate go up to grade 8.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder whether any of those who are taking advanced education are doing so with the aid of scholarships or subsidies from the department, or whether they are on their own as far as the department is concerned? There are about 150 involved at the present time who are doing some advanced study.

Mr. DAVEY: It varies with the individual case. I am not able to tell you which of these is doing it entirely on his own, but we have not refused to assist any student who could meet the entrance requirements and whose academic record continued to be satisfactory.

Mr. MICHENER: I would have thought that there is scope here among the Indians to bring along and educate for the Indian administration some of the better students, and that the department might well keep its eyes open for bright students in the lower grades and bring them to university standard or train them as social workers.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that Mr. Battle told me when I was driving from Medicine Hat to Cardston the other day that we hoped some of these Indian teachers would teach the Indian schools, but some of them preferred to teach in the department schools in non-Indian districts.

Mr. MICHENER: You cannot help that.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I do not know whether I would particularly want to discourage that, if they were acceptable.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Was it because they were paid better in the departmental schools?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that the salaries are about the same. Our salaries, like everything else we do, are the same all over the country. Our salaries are probably not as good as they are in British Columbia.

Mr. DAVEY: I think British Columbia would be the exception.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): How many of these teachers have you?

Mr. DAVEY: In our school system there are 64 teachers of Indian status.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Is the number increasing?

Mr. DAVEY: It is increasing. For example, last year we had 9, at normal schools and this year we have 18.

Mr. FULTON: Have you figures for the number of Indians in the professions —doctors, lawyers, dentists and so on—in Canada?

Mr. DAVEY: No, we have not.

Mr. FULTON: There are some.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is even a county court judge.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickle Belt*): I know some of them. I went to college with some of them.

Mr. FULTON: The superintendent said that they do not take the Indian schools now. I have heard it expressed by some superintendents and teachers of Indian schools that they regretted that they have not been able to take pupils beyond grade 8, because they find that if they leave the school at that age they go back to the reserve and very quickly forget the teaching they have had in the school, whereas they felt that if there were more facilities for carrying on in the high schol, the learning that they acquired, as well as the skills they acquired, would have a better chance of staying with them. I understand that at one time the policy was being followed of enabling the residential schools to teach high school classes. Do I understand from what you said earlier that that is not the policy?

Mr. DAVEY: We do not deny any Indian child the opportunity of going on, but we prefer him to go on to secondary schools with non-Indian children, and we do use in some cases our residential schools as hostels for that purpose. I know of no Indian child who could meet the requirements for high school entrance who has been denied that opportunity.

Mr. FULTON: I understood you to say you are inclined to encourage them to take their high school education in the provincial public schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: And also as far as possible to get them into schools with non-Indian children even in earlier years. We had a long discussion of that in the committee yesterday; wherever a reserve is adjacent to a settled area, and we can make a deal with the local school authorities to have Indian children go to the ordinary schools, it is our policy to close up the Indian schools as rapidly as those substitute facilities can be made available without scrapping new buildings or relatively modern buildings.

Mr. FULTON: It seems to me that you are multiplying your difficulties where you already have residential schools with considerable facilities, in getting Indians into high schools in the provincial public school system, because it would impose an extra burden upon those schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No, we pay the shot.

Mr. FULTON: But if they are going to take them, they have got to provide the accommodation for it.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: We even do that. We help them to provide the accommodation and we give them capital assistance for the provision of that accommodation.

Mr. FULTON: It seems to me that you are duplicating the facilities and increasing the problem.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: All our schools are overcrowded, so I am told. There may be one which is not, one residential school which is not overcrowded.

Mr. FULTON: Do I understand that residential schools desire and are able to teach Indians and carry Indians through to high school, but that you discourage them?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think you had better answer that question, Major Davey.

Mr. DAVEY: We have, at the present—I think it is—5 residential schools which are offering high school work. We do not wish to increase the number of residential schools that are offering high school instruction.

Mr. FULTON: I was wondering whether you are discouraging them or helping them; does your policy go so far that you are trying to discourage them from doing it?

Mr. DAVEY: In cases where there is no alternative but to establish an Indian High School we give them every encouragement.

Mr. BYRNE: Do you find there is some reticence on the part of Indian children in leaving the residential school that is all Indian, or schools which are all Indian, to go into schools with white children, not being in an economic position to afford the clothing and things which the white children are able to afford? Does that leave them with a sort of inferiority complex which causes them not to want to go forward?

Mr. DAVEY: We try to avoid those problems in the case of children boarding at residential schools and going to the nearby high schools. The school administration sees that the children are properly clothed before they go. In other instances we have given assistance to ensure that the child will not feel shy because of his poor clothing.

Mr. FULTON: How long have you had this policy of trying to get those of high school age into the public school system of the provinces?

Mr. DAVEY: It is my understanding that the policy goes back at least to the time when I came into the department which was in 1947.

Mr. FULTON: And how long is it since any of the residential schools have been in a position where they had facilities to offer high school education? Was that done about the same time?

Mr. DAVEY: It would be about the same time. I am not able to give you a definite answer, but my understanding is the first high school offering all the grades was in Saskatchewan and I think it was about 1948 when they had their first grade 12 class.

Mr. FULTON: Are you in a position to make any comparison as to the results now that you have had the two systems operating for about the same length of time?

Mr. DAVEY: We are trying to make a study of that at the present time so that we can come up with objective material that will give us a lead in the matter. We think, however, that the youngster that has received all his training in an Indian school right up to grade 12 finds it much more difficult to make an adjustment after leaving school particularly when he is seeking

employment than in the case of the child who has left an Indian school say at grade 8 and gone to a non-Indian school, and continued there and completed his course.

Mr. FULTON: Is that a conclusion you have come to or do you think that is your conclusion? You said you were making a study of it now, but I gathered at first you had not completed the study and I am asking if that is your own opinion on the conclusion of the study.

Mr. DAVEY: It is an opinion which will be either confirmed or refuted when the study is completed.

Mr. FULTON: Are the majority of your Indians now taking courses in the Indian residential schools or in the public schools of the provinces?

Mr. DAVEY: It will take me a moment to find out.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could have that answer later and go on to section 79.

Mr. MCLEOD: Will you not find that on page 88, table 8, in your annual report?

Mr. DAVEY: If the arithmetic which I have just done now is correct there are 551 Indian children receiving high school education in Indian residential schools and 776 in non-Indian schools.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That would be from grade 9 on?

Mr. DAVEY: From grade 9 and up to and including grade 12.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 79, "Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment". We have discussed that at considerable length already. Are there any further questions on it?

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to make a few remarks about that. It looks to me as though the department have certainly overestimated expenditures here continuously for the last couple of years. I might point out first of all that the estimates are arrived at and then the budget is set to raise the taxes to provide the money which it is proposed to spend by the estimates. If the estimates are inflated that means there is too much in taxes being collected. I wish to point out in 1952-53 there was a surplus in this particular item of $1,618,489 on the estimates of $3,981,850. In 1953-54 the surplus was $178,212 and the estimates was $3,350,086. Then the surplus for March 31, 1955, is $837,700 on estimates of $3,824,200. The estimates we are being asked to vote are $3,927,900. It occurs to me that there is too much money in here—more than the department expects to spend. It has been consistently that way, and as a consequence I move that this item be reduced by $500,000, seconded by Mr. Fulton.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: It think I could explain that difference. I wish I knew some legal method by which the amount you have mentioned could be increased because we have already reached the conclusion that this item is certainly going to be too small and that next March we shall have to ask for a supplementary.

The season of 1952-53 was a tough season for doing construction work. There was an awful lot of competition for the available labour, and particularly for supervisory labour. We wanted to build all these schools but we just could not get the people to do this work. They were badly needed, and our school program got behind. In the year 1953-54 we were out only five per cent, which, in the estimates for a building program of that magnitude is, I think, very close. If it had been much more we would have had to ask

for a supplementary amount, and no one likes to do that. In many parts of the country last year there was so much bad weather that there were very bad delays in all building programs. That is the explanation for this. This year, if we have bad weather and bad luck, we will not be able to spend all our money, but if we have a normal construction season and enough labour available, we will want to spend more than we are asking for.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Chairman, I think that possibly if that explanation had been forthcoming before the item was called, I might have thought differently about it too. As a consequence, I shall withdraw the motion, but I should like to point out that over the years you have consistently underspent. True, in 1953-54 it was not very much, but in this present year and then in 1952-53 it was $1,618,000. The minister has explained it, and I certainly do not want to suggest taking anything away from the education of the Indians.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Or from construction this year?

Mr. MONTEITH: Construction used for their education.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, could the minister say whether most of these contracts which are let are done on a tender basis, or is it necessary to do any on a cost-plus basis?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: They are always advertised, and once in a great while at some of the places in the far north we receive a bid from only one contractor, but we do not like that. I was recently asked to recommend one in northern Alberta, where only one contractor bid, and I said, "I am not at all happy about this; get a list of reliable contractors, a good number of them, and write to them to see if they want to do it." The bid struck me as rather high in comparison with our estimate.

Mr. THATCHER: In none of these figures was there a cost-plus contract?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think that, even when there were no bids, there were firm price contracts.

Mr. FULTON: But I understand that they might have to ask for a supplementary list this year?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I was referring to the estimates about which we were speaking, for next year.

Mr. MICHENER: In other words, the $3,900,000 may not be enough?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: No.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the considered opinion of the minister?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is the considered opinion of the department.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Carried.

Item 80, "Grant to provide Additional Services to Indians of British Columbia".

Mr. MICHENER: Why the special treatment?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is no special treatment. This vote provides additional services to Indians in British Columbia, because the Indians in British Columbia are not treaty Indians and do not receive treaty money.

Mr. MICHENER: I have not yet heard what the amount of treaty money is. Is it $5 per capita?

Mr. JONES: In most cases.

Mr. MICHENER: How many Indians are there in British Columbia?

Mr. JONES: 32,000-odd.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have found that British Columbia, which has a higher standard of living than any other part of the country, is always discriminated against.

The CHAIRMAN: Is item 70 carried?

Mr. MICHENER: We have to consider our report. If we leave item 70 till tomorrow morning, we could dispose of it shortly.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would it be agreeable to the committee if we meet at 10 o'clock in the morning? The cabinet meeting is also called for 10 o'clock, and I should like to go to cabinet if we could dispose of our meeting fairly briefly. I could go to the cabinet later.

An Hon. MEMBER: Could we make it 9.30?

Mr. MICHENER: What about the afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: We might need the afternoon too. We never can be sure as to what this committee will do.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I had hoped that we would finish now. I have missed two or three cabinet meetings while at the committee already.

Mr. MONTEITH: Let us make it 9.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we meet at 9.30 tomorrow morning. Then the meetings next week will commence with a meeting on Monday, March 21. However, if we finish with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration tomorrow, there will be no meeting of the estimates committee on Monday. In that event the first meeting of the estimates committee next week will be at 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday, then at 10.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 3.30 p.m. on Thursday, and 10.30 a.m. on Friday, and perhaps in the afternoon on Friday. At any rate you can count on those meetings next week. We shall be dealing with the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Mr. FULTON: Do we have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon, if we have not finished?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes if the Minister is available.

Mon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I can certainly be available tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There is no possibility of our changing to another department tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

The committee adjourned.

MARCH 18, 1955
9.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are on item 70 of the Indian Affairs Branch, "Administration." Is that carried?

Mr. MICHENER: I should like to speak about publications. I have here the "Indian News", volume 1, No. 1, August, 1954. It has a very fine picture of the minister on the front page and also of his predecessor. I should like to ask about its circulation and so on.

Mr. Laval FORTIER (Deputy Minister, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): This is a new initiative of the department. I believe that the first number was brought out in July. The intention behind that is to inform the Indians of what other Indians are doing, in order to promote better citizenship, if you wish, in the reserves. There is some pride in the Indians, and we are trying to show that Indians are successful and can be successful. We would like to show also the initiative taken in various reserves, so that others may be led by their example. We generally think of Indians as being Indians all over Canada, but they do not differ very much from the other non-Indian population. They have also local problems, and the general view of Indians may vary from one reserve to another. We are trying to show what education has done, what certain projects have accomplished, and so on, in order to create incentive in the minds of the Indians for better administration in their own reserves. At present they are electing their own council in the reserves.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this publication to be circulated among all Indians?

Mr. FORTIER: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Over a certain age?

Mr. FORTIER: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: That will involve about 30,000 copies?

Mr. FORTIER: 20,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Quarterly, and always in English?

Mr. FORTIER: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Is anything published in any of the four major languages?

Mr. FORTIER: You mean, Indian languages; no

Mr. STARR: Is this mailed out?

Mr. FORTIER: It is distributed by the Indian superintendents.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the estimated cost for this year?

Mr. JONES: $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Item 59, "Departmental Administration." Is that carried?

Carried.

Now, gentlemen, I have drafted what seemed to me a properly worded and reasonable report for us to make.

Mr. MICHENER: Before we go on with that, I should like to ask one general question of the minister. I am interested in this report of the Ontario committee, and I am sure it is familiar to most members of this committee. It is a report of a select committee appointed my the legislative assembly of the province to inquire into civil liberties and rights of the Indian population of Ontario and matters related to it. It seems to show a cooperative disposition between federal and provincial governments with respect to Indian affairs, and

it has caused much interest in the province and which, I believe, is shared by British Columbia and the other major provinces with native populations. Generally speaking, that is the picture, is it, with regard to the Indian Affairs department and the provincial administration?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: In most provinces, I think, the cooperation has been very good indeed.

Mr. MICHENER: The provincial responsibility is fairly limited, is it not, as far as the citizens of the country are concerned?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: I was impressed with the study that had been made in the province and the recommendation and report that was submitted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now carried all the items, and we have arrived at the stage of our proceedings where we should consider the form of our report to the House. When we reach that stage it is the rule that we go into camera. I myself have no particular views on it, but it is the accepted procedure. In fact, I think it is definitely the rule that we go into camera.

Mr. HELLYER: Do we report each department individually?

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, I think that was understood. I know that it is the desire of the government, as soon as these estimates are reported, to have them available for the committee of supply. I imagine that it would not be reasonable to ask the committee of supply to consider this department until the proceedings of this committee are all printed, because it would not be fair to the members who are not here, and it would not save the time that we wished to save by this procedure. I spoke to the Minister of Finance in his capacity as the manager of the business of the House, and he told me that he would make every endeavour, just as soon as the proceedings were available to members, to have this department in the commitee of supply, while it was still fresh in the minds of us who have been here. It was hoped that this would make this whole procedure as successful as possible from the point of view of economising the time of the House of Commons. That is one reason why it is desirable to report each department as it is completed.

Mr. FULTON: I think that that was the understanding; otherwise none of the four departments could be proceeded with in the committee of supply until we had completed them all.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite. I presume, then, that there will be no further need for my officials.

Mr. THATCHER: Before your officials leave, as an opposition member I should like to say this. I liked the way Mr. Minister and his officials have answered the questions on these estimates. I should like to thank them for the frank way in which they have given their answers, although I have not always agreed with them. They have done an excellent job. I think that this committee has been of some value, and I believe that this is a good way to deal with these estimates.

Hon. Mr. PICKERSGILL: I should like to say this on behalf of my officials who, I think, on this matter, should not be allowed to speak for themselves, being civil servants. I think I have done my best to indicate that I was not restraining them in any way from giving any facts, where available, even if some of the facts in one or two instances are facts of which we are not very proud. In the main, however, I am very proud indeed to be the head of this department. Perhaps this will be the last time that I shall be able to say that because I have not yet made any impression whatever on the department. The department is still the department which I inherited from my predecessor. In my view it has been administered exceptionally well and, as I said in the House, I have no hope of improving it. I only hope that I can do as well as my predecessor did.

Mr. HELLYER: In this case I would like to agree with Mr. Thatcher. I think the answers which the minister and the officials have made have been very full and complete. Members of this committee and others, have learnt a tremendous amount about this department which I do not think would have been possible if the estimates had been taken in the committee of the whole House, because of the more intimate nature of the proceedings here.

Mr. MICHENER: I should also like to put myself and my associates on record in expressing our appreciation of the assistance which has been given to this committee, and I would like also to say that I hope Mr. Thatcher has recovered from his deep pessimism about the prospects of this committee.

Mr. YUILL: I would like to add my word of congratulation and commendation to the officials for the straight-forward way in which they gave their answers to some of these problems. I think they have done a splendid job and I really feel that this committee is worth while, because, as Mr. Hellyer said, I do not think we would have had such an opportunity of understanding or discussing these matters so completely in a committee on the floor of the House as we have had here. I think that if the work of every department could be discussed as openly and honestly as this one has been, then this committee will certainly justify its existence.

The CHAIRMAN: It is very heart-warming to all concerned to think that when this important work of examining the estimates of a department of government on behalf of the people of Canada is over, that in spite of the differences we have had everybody can feel that the work has been well worth doing. As chairman may I say it has been a real privilege to serve on this committee and I do appreciate the way in which you have wound up this phase of the work. I thank you most cordially for the way in which you have expressed the sentiments you have; you had no need to do so, and the fact that you did so shows that we are satisfied we have been doing the work the House of Commons entrusted to us reasonably satisfactorily. I want to thank you sincerely for the words you have just said.

The Committee continued in camera.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 15

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; and Mr. A. C. Wimberley, Chief Personnel Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55442—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Byrne
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McBain
McLeod
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Thatcher
Yuill—26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

NOTE—The name of Mr. Simmons was substituted for that of Mr. Byrne after the morning sitting.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

MONDAY, March 21, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Hardie be substituted for that of Mr. Decore; and

That the name of Mr. Power (*St. John's West*) be substituted for that of Mr. Pickersgill; and

That the name of Mr. Lesage be substituted for that of Mr. Lafontaine; and

That the name of Mr. Harkness be substituted for that of Mr. Fulton; and

That the name of Mr. Churchill be substituted for that of Mr. Starr; and

That the name of Mr. McBain be substituted for that of Mr. Michener; and

That the name of Mr. Robichaud be substituted for that of Mr. Stuart (*Charlotte*); and

That the name of Mr. Bryson be substituted for that of Mr. Cameron (*Nanaimo*) on the said Committee.

WEDNESDAY, March 23, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Simmons be substituted for that of Mr. Byrne on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

55442—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, March 23, 1955.
(18)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.00 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter T. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Byrne, Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Garland, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Jutras, Lesage, Macnaughton, McBain, McLeod, Monteith, Power (*St. John's West*), Robichaud, Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; and Mr. A. C. Wimberley, Chief of Personnel.

The Committee proceeded to the consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Item numbered 293—Departmental administration—was called.

Mr. Lesage and his officials supplied information concerning the Departmental Estimates under consideration.

At 11.20 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING (19)

The Special Committee on Estimates resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Cannon, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Garland, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Jutras, Lesage, Macnaughton, McBain, McLeod, Monteith, Power (*St. John's West*), Robichaud, Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: Same as at morning sitting.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-56 Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Mr. Thatcher, seconded by Mr. Yuill, moved the following resolution,—

Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have no aggressive policy of developing or populating the Northwest Territories or the Yukon

and Whereas our population in those areas has shown little or no growth in recent years

and Whereas Canada's Northland economic development is lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries such as Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway

Therefore be it resolved that this Committee recommends to Parliament that consideration should be given to the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs for the specific purpose of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Following discussion, the proposed resolution was allowed to stand.

The Minister and his officials answered questions and supplied information relating to the Estimates under consideration.

Item numbered 293 was allowed to stand.

Item numbered 294 was adopted.

The 1955-56 Estimates of the Engineering and Water Resources Branch were considered.

Items numbered 310 and 315 were adopted.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. Thursday, March 24.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

March 23, 1955
10.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum, gentlemen. If you will come to order we will start with the estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

We have the Hon. Jean Lesage, the minister, here and several of his officials. Before I call on him to say a few words and introduce them I thought I would suggest to the committee how we might proceed in line with what has been done before, that I would call item 293, "Departmental Administration," and have a statement from the minister and some general questions on that and then without carrying it we would proceed to the individual items and when we get through the individual items of the department we can revert to the departmental administration so that any members can ask any further general questions that they want or have any general discussion on the department as a whole if they wish.

It seems that that would be the best way of going about it and I thought that that would meet with the wishes of the members. If any item was carried and there was something came up that the members wanted to have further questions on, they could always ask it on general administration because by leaving it to the last it would be possible to do that.

Before I call on the minister he tells me that the External Affairs committee that was conflicting in its meetings with the meetings of this committee because so many members who were on our committee also were wanting to attend the meetings of that committee, has concluded the meetings it planned on before the Easter recess, so we do not need to worry at present about a conflict with them. I had in mind calling a meeting for 3.30 this afternoon of this committee.

Mr. THATCHER: Are you intending to go for two hours now?

The CHAIRMAN: Almost two hours. The minister wants to get away to a cabinet meeting.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Wednesday is not a good day. We have a caucus meeting at 11.

The CHAIRMAN: We called it this morning because we thought we would not be able to hold it this afternoon in view of the conflict with the Committee on External Affairs, but in view of the fact that that committee has finished we can meet this afternoon and if we conclude at 11.30 and adjourn until 3.30 this afternoon—

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: There are several meetings. We are bound to have some conflict.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I don't know that we do need to have any conflict. It is a matter of arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN: We have examined the meetings of other committees and to get the work of this committee done we have to have some conflict. I tried to fit it in with the Committee on External Affairs because there are so many members of this committee who wanted to attend that committee too. So if you are agreeable we will adjourn at 11.30 and then come here again at 3.30.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You say if we are satisfied. Well, I am not satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, the committee gave me the authority to set the meetings as I was able to call them and if we cannot get unanimous approval we will have to hold them in any case.

Mr. THATCHER: What are your plans for the rest of the week?

The CHAIRMAN: Thursday at 3.30 and Friday at 10.30.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I don't mind meeting twice a day.

The CHAIRMAN: There is also the difficulty of the reporters. If we are going to meet too often they get behind in their work.

Mr. HARKNESS: Also there is the difficulty that most of us have other things to do in the House and other places.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What about me? Why not go along with this work and sit twice a day and get this finished?

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, I think sitting twice a day makes the thing a little difficult as far as a lot of people are concerned. You have these conflicts with other committees, as has already been indicated, and as I say most of us have in addition other things we need to do and I think generally speaking two meetings a day makes things a little too awkward. Occasionally it may be all right. It all depends on what is on in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: A great deal depends on what is on in the House and the progress we make and so on, but it was the thought of the members of the committee when it sat previously that this was an extra committee and there were so many committees going to be meeting after Easter that if we did not get a great deal of the work of this Committee on Estimates done before Easter it was going to be even more difficult to get the necessary work of this committee done after Easter. They thought that we should meet now as often as possible when there was not so much conflict with other committees and get as much done as we possibly could. This is an extra committee which we have never had before. We will not meet twice a day this week after today because of the objection and the fact that the reporters are behind in their work, but we will be meeting, as I said, at 3.30 tomorrow and 10.30 on Friday and this afternoon at 3.30.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is another thing, Mr. Chairman. I think it is inadvisable to change the hour of meeting at short notice after it has been set, because as far as I was concerned I had another appointment this morning which was going to keep me busy until 10.30 and then I found this meeting was on at 10 o'clock and it caused me some difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN: That was not done because we wanted to do it but because the minister had something important coming up in the cabinet and he wanted to get the work on this department started. If we were going to have a meeting at all we had to meet at 10.

Mr. HARKNESS: I just wanted to raise that point so it would not occur again, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN: We will not make a practice of it, but that is the reason for it today. I probably should have told the committee at the outset.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of meeting this afternoon? You are having two meetings on this opening session.

The CHAIRMAN: Because we are not going to get very much done this morning, Mr. Churchill.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Let us get started.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister also says his officials have to go to Washington next week, some of them, and that is why he wants to get as much done this week as he can.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As a matter of fact I was going to ask that after we had dealt with departmental administration, as you have suggested, instead of taking the "National Parks Branch". I would appreciate it, if the committee would accept this suggestion that we go on to vote 305, the "Engineering and Water Resources Branch" because the heads of the Branch have to go to Washington for a meeting on work of the International Joint Commission on the St. Lawrence seaway early next week I would appreciate if the members of the committee would accommodate me in accepting this order.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I don't want to go on with this preliminary discussion, but there is one remark of the chairman I would like to clarify. Do I understand that this committee meets at the call of the chair as frequently as the chairman decides?

The CHAIRMAN: That is what they decided after considerable discussion. We were wasting so much time trying to suit everybody that finally the committe said, "We will leave it to you to do the best you can."

Mr. CHURCHILL: In other words, we could meet three times a day if you decided?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the effect of what the committee said.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think that is going a little beyond the functions of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, the last committee agreed with that unanimously. If every time we have a change of personnel we have got to re-debate these things we are not going to get any work done. As I say, that was agreed to unanimously after we had discussed and discussed and tried to meet the wishes of all the members and the committee unanimously decided to leave it to me.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That is right, we had to get started sometime.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The committee changed its personnel, that is all, and there is nothing wrong with that.

The CHAIRMAN: But I do suggest when the committee changes its personnel we should not have to reopen and decide things the committee had decided on before. In fact it is out of order to discuss these things that are decided.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, if it is a new committee—

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a new committee; we are just changing a few members to accommodate the wishes of some of the members.

Mr. CHURCHILL: This is a strange procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest, Mr. Churchill, that when you came on this committee you could have read up on the proceedings that had already taken place so we would not have had to waste time with this proliminary discussion.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, I started off on this committee at the original hearing and this is the first I knew anything like that was laid down.

The CHAIRMAN: We laid it down because we found we were making no headway trying to accommodate every member of the committee, and the committee left it in my hands.

Mr. HELLYER: If the minister has a statement let us get started.

The CHAIRMAN: I realize it is a difficult thing to do these things because right away you are subjected to the suggestion that you are being dictatorial, but someone has to do the job.

Mr. HARKNESS: Might I ask why there is not a steering committee so that these things could be arranged amicably?

The CHAIRMAN: Because there was no suggestion that we needed a steering committee. Any time there is a motion made to have a steering committee I am quite willing to have one if the committee thinks there is any need for it. There was no suggestion that we should have one. But if the committee thinks we should have a steering committee I am quite satisfied to have one.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Well, if a steering committee is going to clear these things up I am quite willing to have one.

Mr. THATCHER: We got along with the first department, there won't be much argument about that.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the committee will agree to what has been suggested so we will call item 293, "Departmental Administration," and the minister will make a statement and introduce his officials and then we will have a discussion on that and pass to 305 after we have had the opening discussion.

Hon. JEAN LESAGE (*Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, I have with me this morning Mr. Gordon Robertson, deputy minister of the department, Mr. Clarence Jackson, one of the assistant deputy ministers, Mr. Frank Carter, administrative officer, and Mr. Wimberley, the chief of personnel, and their advisors.

I do not intend to make an opening statement. My officials and I are in the hands of the committee and we are ready to answer questions. I have distributed a chart showing the organization of the department.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The members have that chart in their hands. The details of this department, as you have seen, are at page 397. Are there any questions on item 293?

Mr. HARDIE: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman,—I notice quite an increase in staff in 1954-55 from 1953-54 in this branch, departmental administration, from 110 to 124. Then there was a further increase in the "Northern Research Co-ordination Centre." Can the minister explain why this northern research co-ordination centre has been taken out of the departmental administration?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): Mr. Chairman, the plan for the northern research co-ordination centre was developed after the government had decided that there should be further research done in certain aspects of northern work that are not at the present time covered by departments already doing research, such as the defence research board and others of that kind, and also that there should be a centre where the results of the work that is being done in various places is pulled together. The objective is to have central point where there is knowledge of all the research that is being done on the north in any and all departments. That was the purpose of the establishment of this centre.

The reason for divorcing it from the administrative branch was really one of convenience. It was thought that it would be better to have a separate vote for it so that the costs of the centre, the requirements of it, were clearly set forth separately. Moreover, it is not really an aspect of departmental administration; it is a co-ordination centre that operates with regard to northern research throughout the government and not purely departmentally.

Mr. HARDIE: With what aspects of research will these people deal?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, the centre will to a large extent coordinate research rather than do research itself. There will be a lot of cases where it will not do anything directly, but rather bring together what others are doing, so we know what the gaps are. There are, however, a few fields of research

that we would like to have done that no department is touching on. For instance, at the present time there is need for research into the Eskimo language. There is no common form of spelling for the Eskimo language and no common form of writing. Both are needed for the education of the Eskimo in the north. There is almost no research as yet into the effect of economic changes on the lives of Eskimos in the north. No department is doing anything of that kind and it is the responsibility of the Department of Northern Affairs if something is to be done.

A further necessity is to have some examination of the adjustment of Canadian legal processes to the Eskimo mentality and society. Application of our laws has caused trouble at the present time in various places in the north and we are planning to have some research on that. That is the sort of thing that might be undertaken.

Mr. HARDIE: From what the deputy minister has said, most of the duties of this branch will be in regard to Eskimos.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Not necessarily, Mr. Hardie. These are merely examples.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I have a few general questions I would like to ask the minister. He is spending on the whole of his department $26 million. I would like to know if he can tell the committee how would that compare with what is being spent by other countries with arctic populations. Have you any idea?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, there has been a certain attempt to find out something about what the U.S.S.R. is doing in its northern work. It is difficult to get any exact or certain information but the information that is available suggests that they are spending about five per cent of their national income on work of various kinds in the north.

Mr. THATCHER: Considerably more than we are then?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Oh, many times.

Mr. THATCHER: I have a clipping here from Time magazine. I don't know how authoritative it is but it says last year Norway spent $40 million on northern development which it claims is ten times what we spent on the same type of economic development. My understanding is that Finland is spending infinitely more than we are doing, and also Sweden. I am wondering if the department knows if this is the case. Would you not care to comment on that fact, that Norway a country with one-third of our population is spending $40 million on this type of work for opening up the north?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Thatcher, we are spending in the north much more than what is mentioned in these estimates.

Mr. THATCHER: For defence?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not only for defence because most of the building in the north is in the estimates of the Department of Public Works and also National Defence.

Mr. THATCHER: And also National Defence?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And also the Department of Transport.

Mr. THATCHER: I see. I would like to just follow this up...

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Just a moment, I have some figures here about the construction in the north, I believe. The paper I have in my hand advises me that the 1954-55 construction programs in the north would involve an expenditure of about $7 million.

Mr. THATCHER: Still pretty small though?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is pretty small and I accept the statement you have made that some countries, among which are the ones that you have named, spend more than we do in the north.

Mr. THATCHER: I would just like to pursue that point for a moment.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Let us not forget, though, that our particular attention to the north has been given only since 1953, when the name of the department was changed and when the Prime Minister in the House of Commons said that we should give more attention to the north. That is, Mr. Thatcher, one of the reasons for the increase in our estimates. These increases have to be gradual, they have to be increases that we can absorb and that we can cope with. We cannot jump to huge figures immediately but you will notice that in our own estimates there is quite an increase this year.

I can foresee that there might very well be another increase next year. As a matter of fact, the program for building in the north in 1955-56 will be double that of 1954-55. According to the prospects it will be $14 million instead of $7 million. But this has to be a gradual increase, you will agree.

Mr. THATCHER: Yes. Mr. Minister, can you tell me roughly what the population in the Northwest Territories was at the end of the war and roughly what it is today?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, I can give you these, Mr. Thatcher, but Mr. Chairman can't we reserve all the questions about the north until we are taking up northern administration and when the head of the northern administration branch is here with his experts? I do not want to dictate anything to the committee, Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands.

Mr. THATCHER: I thought it was administration. I am trying to stay on that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As to the population of the north, there are about 16 thousand in the Northwest Territories and about 10 thousand in the Yukon.

Mr. THATCHER: Then, what plans has the government got to encourage northern settlement? Obviously it is not having much success in getting people to go up there. Have you got any definite plan?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: People will go up there when there are jobs and opportunities available.

Mr. THATCHER: But in Russia and these other places they are making jobs available.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are making jobs available mainly for forced labour.

Mr. THATCHER: How about Norway and Finland? They are developing communities in their northern country on a planned basis. They will come in with bulldozers and open up forests and bring in a whole community so these people who come in there can live a community life.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Don't forget that the climatic conditions in Canada are quite different from those of Finland and Norway.

Mr. THATCHER: I don't think so.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For instance, the treeline in Canada goes diagonally from Churchill in a northwesterly line to Aklavik. Above it is the whole of Keewatin, which has no trees. The only natural resources you have there are the minerals and wild life.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, Mr. Minister, is there any fixed policy which the government has to bring people to the north or try and get it settled?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not a definite policy necessarily to bring people to the north, but it is a general policy of encouraging economic development in the north which will bring up people. Also, which is very important, it is a policy of using manpower possibilities that we have already in the north. I am thinking especially of the natives at the present time.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Minister, Russia I am told has fifty towns, with more than 50,000 population in the north. You say a lot of it has been done by

slave labour. I suppose possibly that is correct and yet they do seem to have a definite policy that will get people into their north country. When all the other Arctic countries are doing the same thing I do not see why our government cannot do something to get people up there. Are we, for instance, doing anything in developing agriculture around these communities?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but you can't develop agriculture in the Canadian shield where there is no possible agriculture in the rocks and tundra. The weather and climatic conditions and the soil are quite different for similar latitudes in these countries that you are talking about from the conditions here in Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, they are different in so far as several of them seem to be doing something.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mind you, there are possibilities in the Mackenzie valley. I went over the Mackenzie valley last year and I believe it is in many places a fertile valley, in spite of the fact that you have only about three months of summer.

Mr. BYRNE: Like here.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is an experimental sub-station at Fort Simpson and we are attempting to educate the local people and to try and train them in agriculture, and especially in gardening as a start. However, it is not very easy, Mr. Thatcher, in a few years, to transform the habits of generations.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, would it, Mr. Minister, be fair to describe the policy of the government at the moment as a kind of laissez-faire policy?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is definitely not a laissez-faire policy. It is an active and vigorous policy of bringing education to the north, and doing everything possible to reduce freight rates in order that the cost of living will be brought down and in order that further economic development may be stimulated by various measures.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Minister, there is no policy for colonizing the north at the moment?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, if colonization means settling people on farms, there is no possibility of colonizing except in the Mackenzie valley and neighbouring areas because there is no other possible farming land. Moreover, the people that we would like to settle on farms first are the native people because their economy is changing rapidly. The price of furs has gone down to a great extent, the wild life resources have been depleted and it is important to try and change the economy of these people. This is not a thing that you can do in an estimates committee overnight; it is a thing that takes years.

Mr. THATCHER: But we have a population vacuum in the north; are you doing anything to try and rectify it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As a matter of fact as far as the native population is concerned it is far from being a vacuum. We have to take these native people, who are doing certain types of work, and try to settle them down to something that their forefathers would never have done. I believe it is one of the most important things we have to do, so that these people can earn their living. Our policy is to reduce the cost of living in the north, to create economic conditions that will facilitate economic development and the exploitation of natural resources and also to bring education to the population of the north so that the natives can be usefully employed in other kinds of occupations than the ones they are occupied in now.

Mr. HARKNESS: I know, of course, this matter of opening up the north either for agriculture, colonization, mineral development, oil development or anything else would perhaps depend on better transportation facilities.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Transportation is the key to economic development. I have said it in the House and I have said it elsewhere and I am still ready to say it.

Mr. HARKNESS: If we accept that then—that improved transportation is the key to the development of the north—I would ask what are you doing in order to improve transportation in the north country?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are presently discussing with the organizations who handle transportation in the north the possibilities of a reduction in freight rates. We are opening up new roads every year in the north and we are studying the possibilities of railway construction from Alberta to the north.

Mr. HARKNESS: On that latter point, how far has your study to complete a railway from—I presume it would be Fort McMurray—into the north gone?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Grimshaw, not Fort McMurray. Our economists have studied it and we are discussing the matter with the officials of both the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways, who jointly own the Northern Alberta Railway.

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, have you come to any definite conclusion yet?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, and I would not wish to comment at this time. I do not believe it would serve any useful purpose if I said more than I have just said.

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, in that case then you have no definite plans or even proposals at the present time for a railway from Grimshaw up into that northern area?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, it depends on quite a number of factors which are being discussed at the present time.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you studied at all the possibility of extending the railway which now runs into the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have a very good system of roads from Whitehorse to Dawson and also to Keno and we are extending it by about a hundred miles.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, the general policy that you are following as far as the Yukon is concerned is not any further railway building; it is a road system?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, and it has been satisfactory up to now to the mine operators.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any proposal to extend that road system right on into the Mackenzie river valley?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: From the Yukon down to Hay river?

Mr. HARKNESS: From the Yukon into the Mackenzie river valley?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, there was the Canol road.

Mr. HARKNESS: That has now fallen into disuse.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes, there were so many summits, it was uneconomic to maintain it. The building of new roads depends on mineral discoveries because I believe all the members of the committee will agree that the economic development of the north depends mainly on the exploitation of the mineral resources. Of course, on the Peel plateau in the north of the Yukon, there is quite an extensive search being made for oil. If that proved to be economically possible, if it were possible to develop these oil resources on the Peel plateau in the northern Yukon, I am pretty sure it would necessitate the extension of our roads to the area and maybe from the Peel plateau to the northern Mackenzie valley.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to me that any real development of the more northerly part of the Yukon and the Mackenzie river valley depends on road connections from the mouth of the Mackenzie river or to the sea through the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The traditional transportation system in the Northwest Territories has been the river system as you know. There is a regular service of Canadian Pacific airlines all the year round as far as Aklavik which is at the mouth of the Mackenzie.

Mr. HARKNESS: The difficulty, though, with the river transportation is that it is open for a very small part of the year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is true.

Mr. HARKNESS: And to have any real development and settled communities you need year round transportation, which in a country as I see it can only be provided by roads and by air?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but don't forget there are more than 1,000 miles, I believe, from Hay river to Aklavik and in order to have an all weather road for a distance of 1,000 miles it has to be economically defensible, which it certainly is not at this time.

Mr. BYRNE: Let us get the trans-Canada first.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have, for instance, the Eldorado Mine on Great Bear lake which is getting all its supplies by fluvial transportation in the three months of the summer and also taking out its ore in the three months of the summer. They stockpile in the wintertime. They do mining all the year round but they stockpile and in the summer time, the three months, the ore goes up the river and they bring back supplies for the winter time. If there is any emergency in winter time there is the airline.

Mr. HARKNESS: Now we are back to the very point that Mr. Thatcher brought up. The reason there is such a small number of people in the north and that development is so limited is that very fact that they have to work in such disadvantages and difficulties as you have at Eldorado and the only way in which that will be overcome is this provision of further roads.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but these roads have to be justified economically.

Mr. THATCHER: It is a vicious circle.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There has to be some possibility of economic development.

The CHAIRMAN: I have just checked the map and it is farther from Hay river to Aklavik than it is from Winnipeg to Calgary.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes, I quite realize that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: When you are talking about distances in the north it is just tremendous.

Mr. HARKNESS: That goes back to the other point . . .

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I was there all last summer and I will tell you next door is far in the north. There are about 200 miles between the little hamlets.

Mr. HARKNESS: Because of the great distance from Aklavik down to the Mackenzie river valley, Hay river and Peace river valley down to Edmonton it seems to me it would be a much more economical possibility to get a road through from the Aklavik area into the Yukon where you already have certain roads and from that way out to the sea. In other words, your distance to markets there and the distance you have to bring in supplies is going to be considerably less than if you have to bring them in right across the continent and up through Edmonton and the Mackenzie river valley.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a possibility that would have to be looked into. Don't forget in Aklavik and around Aklavik there have been no mineral finds and Aklavik has been formed on the fur trade. It is the meeting place where Indians of the region meet the Eskimos and trade their furs. That is how Aklavik was formed.

Mr. HARKNESS: Let us say rather then Aklavik and the lower Mackenzie river valley. There have been oil finds there to begin with.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are more than oil finds. At Norman Wells, the wells are in operation and there is even a refinery.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as the extension of the road which presently runs from Grimshaw up to Hay river, have you any plans in connection with that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No immediate plans, no. As my deputy minister has told me now there has been some consideration given to the possibility of extending it further around Great Slave lake.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is to say not further north but to the east?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To the west around the end of the lake and with the possibility of going around to Yellowknife.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, you are going to bend back from Hay river?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: From Hay river, if you look at a map you will see you will have to go west to follow Great Slave lake and then the Mackenzie river and then you go up north to Fort Simpson.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what I mean, to bend back. The road presently runs really in a north-easterly direction and you propose...

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It runs in a direct north direction. Don't forget that the earth is round.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think there is no argument over that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But if you forget the earth is round you will think that Hay river is to the west, but it is really north.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, if you can hear me over the noise of that snowmobile outside I would like to refer back to this question that Mr. Thatcher brought up of mass population or mass development of the north.

Mr. THATCHER: Just development, it did not have to be mass.

Mr. BYRNE: Are we not doing very much different possibly than the other Arctic countries in that their resources in the south are being rapidly depleted and their population is so great that they must expand to the north? We still feel that we need a mass population of the areas that are very productive and which have still large amounts of land.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I agree you are raising two very important factors.

Mr. BYRNE: I think we are developing as rapidly as need be under the circumstances.

Mr. HARDIE: Mr. Chairman, the questions up to now have been on colonization or of policy the department may have or is reviewing to populate the north. Will the minister agree that the early development is not in agriculture, it is in mining?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Definitelly. I believe I said so.

Mr. HARDIE: Well, has the department any policy whereby they are encouraging from railhead north—that is from Grimshaw north to Hay river along the highway, where they are encouraging colonization in agricultural fields and in that area there are agricultural possibilities. The reason I say that is that the minister said a minute ago that we had to have some economic value at the end of the road. If we are going to build a road or railway we have to

have something at the end of it. Well, if the department was to encourage colonization in that area, in the agricultural area, you could then forget about the road from there to Aklavik as Mr. Harkness has suggested.

Mr. HARKNESS: No, I did not suggest that. I said a road from the Yukon to the lower Mackenzie valley.

Mr. HARDIE: Well, along the Mackenzie river there are no minerals of any great value, at least known, but beyond Great Slave lake there are possibilities that we know, and I think the department of Mines and Technical Surveys should be able to tell us that. Does not the minister think it wise to bring about a policy whereby we spend so much a year every year for roads north of where we can get water transportation, and water transportation is the cheapest transportation you can get although it is high.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are looking after that. You made a good speech in the House on this.

Mr. HARDIE: But north of that, where we can get water transportation should not the policy be to supply roads into this area where the potential is and in that event we will rectify the situation the minister spoke of a while ago of jobs for the people who are there at the present time. We cannot encourage new people to come there unless we have transportation north of the settled areas. If we build the roads now my suggestion is to the minister to bring about a policy where we spend, say, one-half a million a year on roads north of their new area and put these natives to work who have not got work today. When those roads are completed I think you will find mining companies and investors will invest money in going in and developing these potentials we have there.

Mr. THATCHER: Just a vicious circle.

Mr. HARDIE: No, it is not.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I just comment on the first part of what you said now. You mentioned the agricultural possibilities between Grimshaw and Hay river. Well, the agricultural possibilities and colonization are for the most part of this area the responsibility of the government of Alberta. The distance between Grimshaw and Hay river is just under 400 miles and 300 of those miles are in Alberta. There are about 80 miles in the Northwest Territories and the inter-departmental committee which is looking after agricultural possibilities in the north has since the meeting in January been giving their attention to the possibilities of settling people on farms in the area south of Hay river, between Hay river and the border of Alberta, the 60th parallel.

Now, of course, one of the important economic factors in that area would be the opening up of the production of the lead and zinc deposits at Pine Point which are being further probed presently by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, but these things you cannot take decisions on from day to day.

Mr. THATCHER: But you could have an overall policy.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have an overall policy. I believe I have mentioned it, but you have to be sure before you spend thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars to build roads to one given spot that there is going to be some mining production there. Moreover it should not lead only to one mine. We contributed and pay for resource roads as we call them in the north when we know there are possibilities of mining developments in the area. For instance, we are presently studying, we have surveyed last year at a cost of about $50,000 the possibility of building a road between Carmacks on the Yukon river and Ross River Crossing where the Ross river meets the Pelly river about 150 miles east of Carmacks. We have surveyed the possi-

bility of opening up a road there because there have been some surveys, geological surveys, and some prospecting that has shown that there are possibilities of development.

We are going to get from the owners of the companies who are prospecting there definite word about the possibilities of the area, and also from the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys in about a year or so, then we will come to a decision on the economic opportunity of building this road. But we have spent about $50,000 on surveying the road while the prospecting was going on. However, we do not feel we would be justified in constructing a road of 150 miles at this time at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars if the area might prove impossible to exploit economically.

We have to always keep a balance, I know Mr. Thatcher that you are one of the members who is most anxious to see that the money of the government is spent to good avail.

Mr. GARLAND: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, my notice said 10.30 for this meeting. This matter may have been discussed before but I am wondering talking about colonization of the north country as it relates to agriculture. I can take you in my car and in half an hour's drive can take you through thousands of dollars worth of farmland right here that we cannot keep our people on. Now, have you some sort of a super policy for agriculture in the north? Here, where possibly our forefathers came 6, 7, 8 generations ago, the people won't stay on the land—thousands of dollars worth of good land, millions of dollars worth of good land through these older provinces in these older settled areas—you can't keep our own people on the farm and you bring in immigrants from Europe and at the very first opportunity they leave and are off to the city.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Garland, there is no super policy for establishing farms in the north.

Mr. GARLAND: Well, when we start talking about increasing the population there and encouraging agriculture how would you go about it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The native population, the Indian population in the Mackenzie valley is increasing all the time and the price of furs has been going down and the wildilfe resources are reduced compared to what they were. We want to diversify the occupations of those native people and we are looking for farmlands that they can exploit.

Mr. GARLAND: You are only meaning the native people there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are trying to give some lift to their economy because it is pretty bad now.

Mr. GARLAND: Perhaps then I have missed part of it. I got the impression from Mr. Thatcher . . . .

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: From Mr. Thatcher, not from me.

Mr. GARLAND: . . . that we should be developing this thing and increasing the population. I don't see how that could be done but if it is something you are really trying to do with just the native people that is different.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Because of climatic and soil conditions, I don't think there can be in the north any great farm development but we want to try and establish some of the native people there in farming. I don't believe we can expect to do a great deal. Because of the climatic conditions and because of the nature of the terrain over a large part of the area the economic development of the north, as Mr. Hardie said, is based for the most part on minerals.

Mr. HARDIE: Your idea of farming is not farming as we do it down here; it would be more vegetable gardening, wouldn't it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: And you would have to have some people to sell it to and you could only produce vegetables to sell there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe, Mr. Hardie, you are right there. I don't believe there could be farming on such a scale in the north that any produce would be exported from the north. It is only to try and fill partially the needs of the local population.

Mr. HARDIE: That is right, I say your interpretation of a farm there would be more of a vegetable garden, something that would help those people who are in that business to diversify their diet.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right and there may be possibilities established immediately north of the Alberta border to do some general farming. You know the country very well and you know there are possibilities there.

Mr. HARKNESS: A certain amount of dairying has been going on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has been tried further north by the Oblate Fathers and the experience there, I think, as they told me last summer is not very good. I believe Mr. Hardie is quite familiar with that.

Mr. HARDIE: People won't pay for milk at 55 cents a quart when they can buy powdered milk.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder if I could go back to highways. I wonder if the minister would tell me how many miles of highway there are in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon today—just approximately?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: About 130 miles in the north west territories; and in the Yukon—the Yukon is more advanced as you know—over 400 miles, not including the Alaska highway.

Mr. THATCHER: Were most of these highways built by the government or by the Americans?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no, these 400 odd miles are exclusive of the Alaska highway.

Mr. THATCHER: But were any built for defence purposes—say radar stations?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. These are development roads.

Mr. THATCHER: Well, you are getting started on this.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are building 100 miles this year in the Yukon.

Mr. THATCHER: What part is the American government playing in opening up our northern movement?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: None at all.

Mr. THATCHER: They must be playing some part. Are they not establishing radar stations?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But that is not economic development. That is not opening up the north.

Mr. THATCHER: The Americans are spending large sums of money in our north land. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On the DEW line.

Mr. THATCHER: Are there any Americans—any American personnel—up there in addition to those we have mentioned?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is only one place, and that is Frobisher, where there are any number.

Mr. THATCHER: Is that the only place where there are American personnel?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There may be one or two advisers doing work on the DEW line. Most of those who are on the DEW line are Canadians because as you know the contracts have been awarded to the Northern Construction

Company, a Canadian company, for the western part and the Foundation Company of Canada in the eastern part.

Mr. THATCHER: A short time ago a newspaper carried a story about six Soviet scientists who came down on an ice pack which was apparently in Canadian territory. Has the minister some comment to make on that? If we have no population up there, what are we going to do from a defence standpoint?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Those people were not dangerous when they came in on the ice pack. Mr. Robertson is an expert on territorial waters and he could perhaps tell you more about it.

Mr. ROBERTSON: I assume Mr. Thatcher is referring to the indication that these Soviet scientists floated into what is sometimes called the Canadian sector in the north. Canada has never formally asserted a claim to the northern sector as such. Sector lines have been drawn on the map since about 1903 at which time there was no complete knowledge of the land that is in the far north and the indication was that Canada was, in effect, claiming any land within this sector line, though there was no formal statement of claim.

Mr. THATCHER: Has our department made any survey of this island yet?

Mr. ROBERTSON: It has, indeed. The sector lines were not drawn up however, to indicate any claim to water or ice, so when this ice island floated into that sector where it is all water, it entered an area to which there has never been a Canadian claim formally extended.

Mr. THATCHER: It would not be correct to say then that these Russians on this ice pack were ever in Canadian territory?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Not in any Canadian territory to which there has been a formal claim.

Mr. THATCHER: The newspaper report was not correct then?

Mr. ROBERTSÔN: The sector lines are there but those lines were put there only to indicate the areas within which the land was Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: One more question. I would like to know whether our department or the government has any contact with parallel departments in such countries as Norway and Finland.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. With Iceland, Greenland, Denmark.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you got any ideas from these governments recently?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Definitely yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON: As one indication, last summer we sent two members of the department to Iceland to try to get some information of their handling of the eiderdown industry. This is based on the collection of eiderdown which is one of the best insulating materials for northern clothing, and we are hopeful that as a result of this investigation we may be able to establish an eiderdown industry in certain parts of the eastern Arctic in Canada. This summer the head of our Arctic division is going to Denmark to examine their administration of Greenland, and then will go to Greenland afterwards to see what suggestions and policies can be picked up.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I hope you will not complain about his travelling expenses, Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. THATCHER: No. The minister spent $25 millions last year, and he is going to spend $26 million this year. I would like to know since he is spending this money whether he thinks he is going to get more population up there. I think this department should get more money and that it should spend a lot more, but it should be spent on colonization.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can say "yes". There will be more people there next year.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On this subject of colonization, Mr. Chairman, of this 26,000 population, what proportion is Indian and what proportion is Eskimo?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Yukon territory there are no Eskimos except a very few on Hershell island in the Arctic ocean. The Indian population of the Yukon is about 1,500 or 1,600 and they are mostly in the southern part of the Yukon—they are straddling the British Columbia-Yukon border. A few are at Old Crow in the north.

In the northwest territories the population of Eskimos is something over 7,000 now. The Indian population is around 4,000 in the northwest territories mainly in the Mackenzie valley and around Great Slave lake. The 7,000 Eskimos mainly live in the Arctic islands and in the Keewatin district and along the Arctic ocean coast from the border of the Yukon.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Referring to the Indian population—what tribes are represented?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have in the north the Loucheux. South of them, around Fort Simpson—north and south of Fort Simpson—we have the Slaves, the Hares and the Dog-Ribs.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Is there a similar breakdown of the Eskimo population?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, among the Eskimos there are no tribes, no chiefs. The Eskimos have leaders.

Mr. DINSDALE: This morning Mr. Chairman, we seem to be getting into a general discussion on northern administration, and I believe Mr. Robertson has some special knowledge in this regard. We have been asking questions concerning the comparitive development in Russia and Canada for example, and I am wondering if this is the right place for a general statement from Mr. Robertson?

The CHAIRMAN: When we get to northern administration, 312. I was just thinking it would be better if we have more general questions, and if there are no more general questions now, we could pass to 305 and get to northern administration later on.

Mr. HARKNESS: I have a general question relating to this matter of sovereignty. Have we asserted our sovereignty to all those northern islands?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have not only asserted it, but we have exercised it.

Mr. HARKNESS: To what extent have we exercised this sovereignty and just how can our claim particularly to the most northerly islands such as Ellesmere be exercised?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Our claim to the northernmost islands has never been challenged. If you will look at the annual report of the department and the map which is attached to the back cover it shows the effective occupation of the northern islands. There is a weather station at Alert bay which is at the northern tip of the northernmost island; then you have a weather station at Eureka, at Isachsen and at Mould bay. At Resolute bay you have an R.C.M.P. post, a weather station and an air field. At Craig Harbour you have R.C.M.P., at Alexander Fiord you have an R.C.M.P. post. These are all in the Queen Elizabeth Islands which are the northernmost islands. Are you interested mostly in the most northern islands?

Mr. HARKNESS: As this matter was brought up in connection with these Russian scientists who drifted down on an iceflow it was a general question as to what means we had taken to establish our effective occupation of these most northern islands so there would be no question raised as to our sovereignty over those islands.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are occupying these islands effectively now. We have these weather stations where there are Canadians living all the year around.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as international law is concerned there is no question about the actual occupation of these islands by Canada?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: On the map that symbol shown as a wildlife warden post should be a weather station, should it?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Departmentally it is a wildlife post. The weather station is the main thing, but it is not our department. The wildlife aspect is our function.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are not these so-called Russian scientific teams mainly weather stations?

Mr. ROBERTSON: As far as our information goes they have done weather research work, but they have also gone far beyond that. They are doing research into ice conditions and into the topography of the bottom of the Arctic Ocean which they think has important influences on the ice drift, fish resources and that sort of thing. They are also investigating snow and water conditions, and marine life.

Mr. DINSDALE: Do you know if we obtain weather data from their weather stations?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a very good exchange between Russia and Canada. I would say we are getting more than we are giving because the Russians have 200 weather stations in the north and we have very much less. We exchange all the information.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is one other question in regard to the establishment of sovereignty. Is there any definite demarkation between some of these northern islands and the frozen water?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: North of Ellesmere island which is the most northern island there are places where some ice stays all the year around but at other places it breaks in July and August.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is a fair amount of this area where the ice stays and it is difficult to tell where the land ends and the ice begins, is it not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, in some cases that is true.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any plan on foot to determine where the line of demarkation is? In other words what area we have and what area we have not sovereignty over?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The whole question is under very serious study by an inter-departmental committee, the whole question of territorial waters.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think this is a very important question at the present time in view of the fact that the Americans are establishing certain weather stations and military installations in the norh.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What has that to do with it?

Mr. HARKNESS: I think it brings up the whole question as to what area there we have sovereignty over and what area we do not have sovereignty over.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The Americans are not establishing weather stations in the north. The weather stations we have in the north are operated and manned by Canadians. There are some stations where there are some Americans up to about half strength, but the commanding officer at each station is a Canadian.

Mr. HARKNESS: The Americans did establish some kind of an installation on what developed eventually as a floating island T 3.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is different. I thought you were talking about weather stations on the mainland.

Mr. HARKNESS: When it was established I do not think that they knew it was a floating island.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Robertson informs me they did know that when it was established and it was established because it was a floating island.

Mr. HARKNESS: In any event that demarkation of where the land ends and the ice begins is under study?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is under study, and may I go further and say that this whole question of territorial waters is a very tricky question of international law which is under very careful and serious study by an inter-departmental committee at the present time and my deputy is the chairman of that inter-departmental committee.

Mr. THATCHER: Along these lines, I have an article here from the *Christian Science Monitor* of about a week ago. I am not going to quote it, but the gist of it is "Americans will attack the far north". Apparently they are going to open up this Dew line and the McGill line.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If the McGill fence line relates to the mid Canada line, it is being built at the expense of Canada and by Canadians.

Mr. THATCHER: Americans are spending far more on radar lines than Canada is spending?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Where they establish these stations will not that mean that there will be kind of a little community spring up and also mean that American personnel will do a good deal to open up that territory?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There will be American personnel but, according to the agreement with the United States, the stations can be taken over by us at our option at any time and our criterion is manpower.

Mr. THATCHER: These various stations should mean a great deal to the development of the north.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe so.

Mr. THATCHER: Why do you say that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Because they will be defence establishments, and they will be isolated. It might mean some increase for the transportation companies that we have. Certainly the building period will mean some increase in the business for our martime and air transport organizations.

Mr. THATCHER: There will be one or two small communities.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It will mean some employment for trained and chosen Eskimos.

Mr. THATCHER: Will communities likely spring up around each of these posts?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We certainly would not like to see the Eskimo become some kind of camp followers around these places.

Mr. THATCHER: They would be permanent communities, would they not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I use the term "camp followers". If the Eskimo were living around these establishments, unless they had regular employment at the stations, there would be a danger of disrupting completely the Eskimo way of life. You know the Eskimo problem is a very difficult one. Here you have these hundreds of people living their native way of life. You cannot

bring them from the stone age to the atomic age overnight. They need a lot of preparation. Otherwise you will be ruining them, and you will ruin the whole Eskimo population.

The CHAIRMAN: I said that we would adjourn at 11.15. I wonder if we might not take it that we have passed to item 305 with the understanding that should any general questions arise out of the specific sections we might be reverting to them?

Mr. HARKNESS: No, Mr. Chairman. I have some specific questions on administration.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well then. We shall now adjourn until 3:30 this afternoon in Room 277 because we could not get the use of this room.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum. We are still on administration. Item 293.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do you want to continue, or go on to water resources.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You told me that we could finish this. We still have tomorrow and Friday.

The CHAIRMAN: I think myself that if we can have questions on a specific item we might cover some of the questions which could be asked on the general item which would make it easier for the officials to deal with, and if there was a general item they could speak to it afterwards.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I understood that Mr. Harkness and Mr. Thatcher had some questions on general administration.

The CHAIRMAN: If they are general questions we can have them.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice that there has been an increase in the number of clerks, stenographers and people of that sort on the administrative staff. The increase is quite considerable in proportion to the number who are employed. Does that indicate that amount of red tape and amount of passing back and forth of paper is increasing in this department? It seems to me that this is a department in which there is perhaps room for a considerable increase in the staff, but I think it should be with regard to staff who are concerned with the actual working out of problems in the field and therefore I was somewhat disappointed to see this increase in the number of file clerks and various other clerks which seems to have taken place because, as I said, it would appear to indicate that the department was becoming a paper making machine.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As to the question you have asked Mr. Harkness, it is, I believe "is there more red tape?" The simple answer is "no". The explanation regarding the increase in the numbers of personnel, and especially as to administrative personnel, will be given I believe by Mr. Jackson.

Mr. C. W. JACKSON *(Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources)*: We have prepared a statement here for the information of the committee going back to the year 1950, and showing the increase in the administrative staff. In 1950-51 we had a total of 131 on the staff at administrative headquarters. That dropped in the year 1951-52 to 110. In 1952-53 it was 113; in 1953-54, 109; and in 1954-55 it was 110. Now there is an increase of 14 in the next fiscal year and if the committee would like an explanation of how that increase arose, I shall be glad to provide that explanation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have mimeographed copies of these figures. If it is the wish of members of the committee we could circularize them.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would help the committee to follow these figures.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It does not show the details of the increase but it does show the comparative figures from 1950-51 to 1955-56.

Mr. HARKNESS: The only point I raised there was in connection with the increase in the number of clerks and secretarial staff which I thought was a bad indication because it seemed to show that red tape and paper work were increasing.

Mr. JACKSON: In 1950-51, Mr. Harkness, we had 131, so there has been a decrease over the last five years.

Mr. HARKNESS: But is it not true that the department has changed since 1950. Its responsibilities are different.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. That was when the Department of Resources and Development was formed. We have changed the name, but not the functions.

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Hardie's point is perhaps right in the sense that there has been an increased emphasis on northern work and that is reflected in part in these changes. There is an increase in the economic division because of the desire to do more work on the economic possibilities of development in the north. There are also other provisins which are directly or indirectly related to that.

Mr. THATCHER: I have one or two questions to ask on general policy, and I want to move a motion before I am finished. I see from the overall estimates that we are spending $7 million on actual northern affairs.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: And I believe that a lot of that $7 million is being spent on head office administration and the like, so as far as genuine northern expenditure is concerned, I suppose the amount is even less than that. The point which I tried to make this morning was that a country with a quarter of our population, Norway, is spending $41 million this year, and other countries in the north are also doing much more for the Arctic areas than Canada is doing. The minister said this morning that one of the reasons, perhaps, was that climatic conditions are different, soil conditions are different, and the like. During the interval between our sittings I went down and got a map from the library and when I looked at the map I found that when we take the 60-degree line, the southern boundary of the northern territories, we find that all of Iceland, most of Alaska, two-thirds of Sweden, four-fifths of Norway, two-thirds of Finland and one-half of Russia lie above this line.

I suggest that the difference in development rates between Canada and those other Arctic countries is not so much caused by geography and soil and similar factors as the minister would have us believe. I think these Scandinavian countries and Russia are conscientiously trying to develop their northlands, and it looks to me as if Canada is not doing that. This year we are spending ·16 per cent of our budget on northern development. $7 million out of $4,360,000,000. I do not think that is good. I think that our northern development program—and I do not blame the minister for it; if he could get a lot more money he would probably spent it—I think our northern development program is inadequate, short-sighted, and lacking in imagination and aggressiveness.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Then give some imagination to it. Tell me what I should do.

Mr. THATCHER: One moment, Mr. Minister. I think the bankruptcy of our northern development program is borne out by the population figure.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You are speaking for the press and you know it.

Mr. THATCHER: I move, and I regret that I do not have one of my colleagues here because he happens to be sick, but the hon. member for Jasper Edson, has kindly agreed to support my motion, or at least to listen to it, whether or not he will agree on it I do not know—but I move as follows:

> Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have no aggressive policy of developing or populating the Northwest Territories or the Yukon;
>
> —and Whereas our population in those areas has shown little or no growth in recent years;
>
> —and Whereas Canada's Northland economic development is lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries such as Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that this committee recommends to parliament that consideration should be given to the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs for the specific purpose of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman, that is a general motion, and I hope it is one that even the minister will find possible to accept. For the reasons given I would like to make it a motion.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I say a few words, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the wording of the motion can be very easily accepted if some of the words were changed. Perhaps it should read: "Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have an aggressive policy of development and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, therefore it is resolved that this committee commends the Department of Northern Affairs for enlarging and extending its activities for the specific purpose of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon."

I believe you would then have a point Mr. Thatcher, because that is exactly the policy which the department is following. When the hon. member says that we are spending only $7 million this year for the furtherance of development in the north, he is not correct, because one of the responsibilities of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources is to coordinate the activities of all departments in the north. Take for instance the Department of National Defence. That department is spending about $6 million a year on the maintenance of the Alaska highway in the Yukon, not taking into account the part of this highway which is in British Columbia. The Department of National Health and Welfare is spending a tremendous amount of money on Eskimo and Indian health, and it is going to build a hospital at a cost of $3 million dollars up in Whitehorse. There is going to be a bridge built over the Yukon River to expand the city of Whitehorse. Three-quarters of a million dollars—

Mr. THATCHER: A drop in the ocean.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are going to prepare the ground for a whole new section of Whitehorse on the other side of the Yukon river. There is going to be a vast amount of money spent by the Department of Transport, and some money will be spent by Public Works. When figures like $40 million are given for expenditure in the north by other countries, it is well to remember that this includes all expenditure by all departments of government.

Mr. THATCHER: It does not.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It includes all expenditures which are made in the north by one government because they do not have the system of government which we have in this country where there is a division of responsibility between the federal government and the provinces.

Mr. THATCHER: The provinces do not spend anything on this.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, but the territorial bodies are spending quite a lot of money in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories for that purpose and among their revenues there are the amounts which they receive from us under the tax rental agreement. Apart from that they are spending money which they collect through their own taxes and other sources of revenue.

Mr. THATCHER: Their whole budget was 1¼ million last year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For the Northwest Territories that may be, but if you add all the millions which are spent by this department—

Mr. THATCHER: $8,000,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: —and all the other departments you arrive at a figure which is much higher than $8 million. The member this morning was talking about defence installations; the cost of defence installations in the north is not included in those figures, while it might be in the figures which the member has quoted for other countries.

As I said this morning you cannot go quickly over the economic development of a whole continent. It is a million and a half square miles. You have to lay the foundation for an orderly development, otherwise you may build roads that will lead to nowhere. The hon. member for Moose Jaw would be the first one to criticize us if we should spend millions of dollars for roads leading to the tundra or places where we had only the hope that there would be mining developments. We have to probe to see if the people who are going to live there are going to be able to earn their living or be on relief. What is the purpose of opening up roads into the tundra or to mines which are not economically exploitable.

Mr. THATCHER: Are you asking me?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am giving the answers. Everybody knows there is no use of doing such a thing; everybody knows that.

Mr. THATCHER: That is not the point.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The member says that the climate has nothing to do with it. Certainly it has a lot to do with it. We have no gulf stream in the north of Canada, which temperates the northern regions of the European countries.

Mr. THATCHER: There is no gulf stream in Siberia.

The CHAIRMAN: The acoustics here are very poor. If more than one person is speaking at the same time it is difficult for the reporter. I would ask that when one person is speaking there should not be interruptions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In Russia they sent forced labour to Siberia which we have not done and which we will not do. We are not yet a C.C.F. government.

Mr. THATCHER: That is not even funny.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Also in those countries there was and is a surplus of population which naturally goes north.

Mr. THATCHER: What about Finland, Norway, Sweden or Iceland?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The population of this country is scattered over a wide area south of the 60th parallel of about 3 million square miles and the population of Canada has been and is still very busy developing Canada south of the 60th parallel. The countries which have been mentioned here need the natural resources of their northern parts immediately. Here we want to show the same kind of vision for the north that our forefathers have shown for the west.

Mr. THATCHER: That is what I want you to do.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But we want it to be established on safe grounds. We are ready to take risks, but they must be reasonable risks; the kind of risks which on balance are likely to bear fruit. Also we do not wish to put forward too ambitious programs which cannot be absorbed at the present time by the population which we have there or by the facilities which we have there or by the natural resources which can be exploited at this time. This is a long process and one of the difficulties is the human problem. There are really two problems; the problem of economic development and the human problem which is the problem which is presented by the natives up there. I believe that this human problem for the present is as important as the economic problem in the north. You have a population of natives there which is in difficulty. The wildlife resources have diminished; the price of furs has gone down terribly. We have to try to diversify the activities of these natives in the north. This is a long process. As I said this morning you do not transform people who have been living for generations in the stone age overnight into the atomic age. It is a problem which might take generations. We should not be discouraged.

Mr. THATCHER: How are these other countries doing it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I want to show to the hon. member the kind of problem we are facing and show him that these problems are of great magnitude and that they are very complex. There is no simple approach to them. You can say we are going to spend more money. Why should we spend more money to no avail. We are and will be spending more money and will be increasing our expenditures in a normal orderly development. That is our aim, and instead of being blamed for what we are doing I believe Mr. Thatcher should have presented a motion of congratulations.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think the general purpose of this resolution is one with which I would agree. In spite of all the minister has said I do not think there is any doubt about it, and I think perhaps we would all accept without much argument that the development of the northwest has not gone ahead very progressively, not only under this government but under every government we have had in power in Canada. None of the governments have been too aggressive in developing these northern areas. The general idea with all people of Canada I think is along that line. I also think the time has come when we should be following a more aggressive policy than has been followed. The minister spoke of the fact that there was no use building a road into a mine which might not be economic and various other things along that line. However, as I think I indicated in the discussion this morning, it seems to me that the crux of the whole development in the north is better transportation facilities. You cannot do anything until you get more ready means of access, ingress and egress. In order to do that there has to be a considerable amount of expenditure which is not going to give any immediate return. In the same way when the Canadian Pacific Railroad was put through here everybody said it was an economic monstrosity and they wanted it to go down through the United States. As a matter of fact Mr. Hill refused to build it in Canada and he withdrew when the government insisted it should go through western Canada. The whole idea of it was to open up the country and eventually it became an asset. I think the same thing applies to the north country to quite an extent, and we are, I think, going to have to spend money in order to develop communications there from which there is not going to be an immediate return. I think that the idea that Mr. Hardie put forward this morning, that roads should be extended up around the Great Slave lake—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe I was the one who mentioned that.

Mr. HARKNESS: —was a good idea and the sort of thing which should be done promptly.

However, it seems to me that probably this is not the right time for us to be discussing a general resolution of this kind. It would seem to me that perhaps a more orderly way of dealing with this whole matter would be to go into these estimates, get the information as to how much has been done, and then when we come to make up our report, after having finished with the estimates, we could then make particular recommendations, not in such general terms as this, but in regard to specific matters, such as the provisions of more roads, and so on, as the committee then would think desirable.

Therefore, I suggest that instead of spending a lot of time—perhaps all of today and maybe another sitting, discussing a general resolution of this sort, it would be better to have the resolution stand until we have completed the estimates, and then to have a general discussion on the whole situation including this resolution. We could then make our recommendations in the light of the information which we have secured.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I just say one word, Mr. Chairman. It is that I agree with Mr. Harkness that it will be much easier to discuss this resolution when we have studied the estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and when the committee will know how the money is going to be spent, whether it be wisely or unwisely. I would be much easier.

You have said that the north has been neglected. Surely there was not very much attention given to the north up to a very few years ago. As a matter of fact, you may remember that the Prime Minister said in the House that we had been handling our north in a kind of state of absence of mind. But that is where I disagree as to the present. I have not been absent mentally for the last year and a half. I agree with what was said this morning, that the key to the development is transportation. I have said that not only in the House but elsewhere. We will have to take risks and make long term investments. I could not agree with you more.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, this is really a very interesting discussion, but it must be admitted that during the past year, since our present minister and his deputy have been in office, the north is really showing some signs of an aggressive policy of development, and of populating the Yukon, for which I speak, as well as for the Northwest Territories to some extent.

I listened to the minister's reply, and I can do nothing else but support him in what he has said. Mr. Lesage, with his deputy, and his assistant deputy travelled through the Yukon last summer and I had the privilege of accompanying them everywhere they went. He took a keen interest in the development of the country, and in the people of the Yukon in particular, and those people hold the minister and the deputy minister in very high regard because they know right now that they are getting a square deal.

I have heard so many fine comments since your trip up there, Mr. Lesage, that I am convinced, from what I have seen in the past, that we are going to get somewhere, although the policy may not be too aggressive at this particular time. Nevertheless I am firmly convinced that the department, under the able leadership of the present minister is doing everything possible for greater development throughout our territory.

In the territory of the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories, as has been said today, the great problem is that of transportation. In the Northwest Territories especially transportation costs are higher than in the Yukon. Our transportation costs in the Yukon have always been high and they still are. There has been no reduction over the years. The only thing that will bring about a reduction is to have more roads and better transportation facilities. The department, I must say, is endeavouring to bring this about.

Take for instance the Alaska highway. Had it not been for the Alaska highway, we would today have but a little village at Whitehorse of let us say three hundred people, whereas now we have a population of six thousand. So I could not support the first two sections of this resolution.

The first section reads:

> Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have no aggressive policy of developing or populating the Northwest Terrritories or the Yukon.

That is not right. I must say in all fairness to the department that it is not right.

In 1941 we had a population in the Yukon of somewhere around three thousand, whereas now we have, I think, possibly eleven thousand or twelve thousand. In Whitehorse alone, we had at that time a little village of three hundred people prior to the construction of the Alaska highway; whereas now we have approximately a population of six thousand. So the first section of the resolution simply does not make sense.

The second section of the resolution reads as follows:

> And whereas our population in those areas has shown little or no growth in recent years.

Mr. THATCHER: The figures the minister gave us show but little growth there from 1945 to recent times.

Mr. SIMMONS: It is not right. For instance, let us consider the tourist trade up in the Yukon last year. According to the figures there were 46,066 tourists who visited the Yukon territory; and in addition there were 9,784 returning Canadian residents. Foreign passenger cars entering the Yukon territory amounted to 10,994; and foreign commercial vehicles amounted to 1,939. That does not show that we had but a dozen up there prior to 1942. I can only say that it shows excellent signs of developing, and that it will continue to develop under our present minister and his able deputy.

I was interested to hear this morning what the members had to say about transportation on the Mackenzie and into the Yukon. It has been the policy in the past, I believe, to get the population in before you build the roads. But I do not think that the department could possibly adopt that sort of policy today. You have got to put your roads in, let us say, to a potential mining area or some place where you might have a settlement; then you are going to get the population.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Is that not what we are doing? That is why we conducted that survey along the Salmon river.

Mr. SIMMONS: What should be taken into consideration, gentlemen, is a railroad into the Yukon Territories along the Rocky Mountain trench and into Alaska. I know that the Americans have been thinking about it for many, many years. In 1942 the army made a survey and spent $10 million on it; but at that time there was a shortage of steel which interrupted the plan.

There are many other matters I could go into, but there is one in particular of which I shall speak; "Canada Vacations Unlimited" has just now come to hand. This book was issued by the Tourist Bureau, and for each of the several provinces there are two full pages of lovely pictures, and suggestions of where to go and what to do. There is only a page and a half about God's country, the Yukon and also the Northwest Territories.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will have to agree that this is the first time that there is something about the north.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, it is the first time, but there is not one word about Dawson City, which is the most historical part of the north country, and the centre of Yukon history. This morning something was mentioned about a

road from Dawson or Mayo, into the Mackenzie river valley. I have flown over that road many times, Mr. Chairman, and I find that a road from Dawson or Mayo to Aklavik would be approximately 350 miles. From Mayo in the Yukon, to Skagway, Alaska, is approximately 325 miles. So I think it would be a good idea for departmental engineers to investigate that route and give it a little study. That is one reason I am sorry to see Aklavik being moved so far east. It would be logical to have the transportation in and out along this other way, and it would be the cheapest in the long run. I have much to say about these various items, but I will not hold you up any longer.

Mr. McLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised to see the minister taking offence at this motion.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a non-confidence motion.

Mr. McLEOD: No, I cannot see it in that way.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the way we interpret it.

Mr. McLEOD: I am surprised to see him take offense. Certainly some statements are made in the first part that population is not increasing at a satisfactory rate, and so on. In these things there may be room for argument, but the main part of the resolution is that we recommend to parliament that they take a little more interest in the development. Now, I cannot see where that is any reflection whatever on the minister.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you read the first paragraph.

Mr. McLEOD: Yes, there are two or three things.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Two or three things that amount to a vote of non-confidence.

Mr. McLEOD: I cannot see that. I think that they are taking the wrong attitude. They appear to have no aggressive policy. "Aggressive" can have quite a variety of meanings. You can have different stages of aggressiveness. I think that in the short time in which it has been headed by the minister the department has shown good progress.

An Hon. MEMBER: It is an aggressive motion.

Mr. McLEOD: There is no reason to take offense at it. This is the first time that I have heard of a minister refusing to accept further money from parliament on a suggestion that parliament give him more money. However, that is something that is perhaps none of our business. You were speaking of the two problems, the human problem and the economic problem. Much has been said so far about development. It was mentioned this morning that perhaps too much stress should not be placed on that so long as the co-called settled parts of Canada were in need of promotion, and I agree with that. I am not in favour of simply rushing into the north and pouring millions of dollars into development until it becomes necessary to find a field for further population and for further development. There is perhaps some basis for the minister's contention that we are assuming an aggressive policy, but in the eyes of the mover of the resolution, of course, it is not aggressive enough. On the other hand, I think that there must be said for the argument of this department that the time to bring in this resolution would be at the close of our session, when we are making our recommendations and presenting our report to parliament. There is much to be said for this, and I do not think that the minister should take offense at it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not offended in the least. It would take much more than that to offend me, especially coming from my friend Mr. Thatcher, but I would just say that the wording of this motion amounts to a motion of non-confidence.

Mr. McLEOD: I do not believe you can deny that we are lagging behind the other countries. You cannot disagree with that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I shall not discuss it at this time because I suppose it is a motion that should be discussed after the individual expenditures have been studied, as Mr. Harkness has suggested.

Mr. YUILL: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this motion, certainly the last thing in my mind was that it would be construed as meaning a censure of the department. I think that the department is doing a very good job. But I thought it would strengthen his hand in doing the very thing he wanted to do, namely, to look after the development of the known potential there. I am the last one in the world to agree that he should go out and build roads for the sake of building them or to develop anything that is not going to prove economically sound, but I thought that this motion would strengthen his hand to get more money to develop the known potentials in that area. Take, for instance, the area around Grimshaw; that is as far as I have been, and there is good farming country running considerably north and east of that. There is a considerable potential there to be developed, I believe. Further to the northeast, I believe there is a considerable mineral potential which could be safely developed. I have the impression that, by trying to make available some money for this or that development, we would strengthen the hand of the minister. Certainly the last thing which I had in my mind was that it criticizes or censures the department. I think that for the development of the physical elements which he has mentioned, his supply of revenue is very definitely inadequate. Now, that was my purpose in seconding this, to strengthen his hands and not to detract from his potentialities as a minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hardie.

Mr. HARDIE: Mr. Chairman, I will confine my remarks to the motion. We are all speaking on this first item. I agree with Mr. Harkness that this is not the time. I suggest to Mr. Thatcher that possibly we had better go through the items on the estimates and find out if there may be some items in the estimates and after we have gone through the estimates he will be in a better position to put in his motion.

We are presuming everything on other years now and as far as the motion is concerned I cannot go along with the second part of it where he says he recommends to parliament "the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources." I cannot go along with that. Possibly if he said he recommended more money be voted for the department I could go along with it.

Mr. THATCHER: That is what I say. I say for the specific purpose of opening up and developing.

Mr. HARDIE: But not for the increasing of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is a very good point.

The CHAIRMAN: Next on the list is Mr. Garland, if you are through, Mr. Hardie. And then Mr. Deschatelets and Mr. Dinsdale.

Mr. GARLAND: Mr. Thatcher said this was of sort of a general nature and I am sure that he must have given this matter considerable thought. I am sure in the wording he has used here, "the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources," that can only mean spending more money and I am sure that none of us would want to spend more just for the sake of spending more. I wonder if Mr. Thatcher at this time would be prepared to enlighten the committee as to his own views for accomplishing what he has suggested in the second last sentence ". . . opening up, developing and populating."

The CHAIRMAN: Do you mind, Mr. Garland, if Mr. Deschatelets and Mr. Dinsdale speak first and then he can answer them as well?

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I have nothing much to add, Mr. Chairman, except that the motion is certainly premature. As far as I am concerned I do not know much about this department, but I am perfectly sure that after we have gone through with all these items I will be in a position to state if we are doing everything possible in these circumstances to develop these territories and I think that the hon. member for Moose Jaw should withdraw his motion without prejudice. He will have all the opportunity he wishes after we have gone into these items to make the same motion later.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless Mr. Thatcher is prepared to accept the suggestion of Mr. Deschatelets Mr. Dinsdale is next. Are you not prepared to withdraw the motion at the present time?

Mr. THATCHER: I think it would just waste time, Mr. Chairman. We might as well vote on it and get it over with. If you want me to do so I will do so, but it will have to come up later.

The CHAIRMAN: I think what most of the committee have in mind is this: after we get through examining the expenditures of the whole department and have heard the explanations of the minister he will be questioned if he thinks he could use more money in certain branches if he were given it by parliament, and if he gives the committee any idea that he could really do a better job if he got more money then the committee when reporting to parliament might go so far as to commend him for his energetic work since he has been in charge of the department, along the lines of what several members have stated and recommend that every possible consideration be given to this particular department.

I think that is what your seconder actually had in mind from what he said. I don't say we necessarily have to pass a resolution like that, but I think that is more in line even with what you had in mind yourself. It was not that you were so anxious to censure the present minister as to urge that every possible step be taken to open the north up.

Mr. THATCHER: If it is the wish of the committee to table this motion until the last item I have no objection at all. I was just wondering if we won't waste more time in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we would save time at that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Can I say this now, Mr. Chairman, that if the motion is only urging the government to give attention to the north in the words that you yourself have chosen, if it was not meant as a motion of non-confidence as the wording of this motion indicates, it would be quite different. I am sure Mr. Thatcher will want to revise his wording.

The CHAIRMAN: We can take that up when we are making our final report. I think that would be the best time to do it.

Mr. THATCHER: I agree with that.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I notice here on your central administrative staff you have increased the number of information officers and editors from seven to ten. What do those people do? What is their purpose and why has there been this increase?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, as to the increase, it is directly related to the greater interest in northern development and the increased activity in the north. There has been a tremendous increase in the number of requests for information about the north and for publications about the north. Very few of the publications that the department has at the present time are up to date. We had hoped to revise some of these and bring them up to date on the economic

possibilities in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories and various aspects of the northern work but we have not had the staff to do it. These three increases in staff are specifically for that purpose.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice, however, the amount you are going to spend on the publications is the same this year as last year, which does not indicate very much increase in the amount of publications you are going to put out.

Mr. ROBERTSON: That, sir, is spread over all the votes. I can give some indication of the number of publications there are, which would indicate that the northern part is only one portion of it. The increase in publications in regard to the north is only a small fraction of the over-all total. Moreover, it won't be fully reflected for a few months at any rate, until some of the new work is done. At the present time we put out publications as follows. This is for 1954-55:

National museums, 10 publications, totalling nearly 5,000 pages.
Water resources division, 9 publications, 81 pages.
Forestry branch, 43 publications, totalling 1,200 pages.
National parks, 3 publications, totalling 74 pages.
Northern administration branch, 3 publications, totalling 134 pages.

Administration branch, there was simply the annual report of the department. Finally there were various articles in the branches such as the scientific articles of the forestry branch and articles by the national parks branch, a number of articles totalling about 500 pages.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do I understand that these officers in the branch do all that work for all the other branches?

Mr. ROBERTSON: That is correct. The writing of a publication on a technical forestry subject might be done in the forestry branch by a technical officer who knew that subject. The editing and revising would be done in the information branch.

Mr. HARKNESS: Are these people responsible for putting out the publications referred to by the Travel Bureau also?

Mr. ROBERTSON: No, Mr. Chairman, the Travel Bureau does most of that work itself. It is the one exception. As you will notice there was no reference to any Travel Bureau publication in the list I read. It is the other branches.

Mr. HARKNESS: Then, I note following that you have set out—it will be part of the work of these people apparently—films, advertising displays and other informational materials other than publications $200. Now, I can't quite see the force of having this vote for $200 in there because in my own experience for $200 you cannot get one of these film people to come and even give you an estimate.

The CHAIRMAN: What page are you referring to?

Mr. HARKNESS: Page 398.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the summary following the details?

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes. In other words, the thing doesn't seem to make sense.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This amount is required for minor items such as photographs, prints, mats, etc., for providing informational material to the press and magazines.

Mr. ROBERTSON: There are items like this in most of the branches for these specific limited purposes.

Mr. HARKNESS: This $200 isn't just for pictures of the administrative staff and a few things along that line?

Mr. ROBERTSON: For more general material. There could be specific technical information and specialized material provided by various branches.

Mr. DINSDALE: I have a general question on the administration chart. I see a reference here to the National Battlefields Commission and the National Parks and Historic Site Board. Is there not something in common in the work of these two groups?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. The National Battlefields Commission is an independent commission which was formed in 1908, I believe, to preserve the battlefields in Quebec, and it bought the land. Mr. Dinsdale you have been to Quebec and you know where the battlefields are. This land was bought out of money which was obtained from public subscriptions. As a matter of fact there were contributions from the governments of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and other Commonwealth countries which were put into the fund. This money was used to purchase the land and it was sufficient to pay for maintenance in the first years of operation, but in the last 40 years the Battlefields Commission have maintained their work through annual votes from Parliament. Last year the amount was increased by an amendment to the Act from $100,000 to $125,000. Today I myself, on the orders of the day, tabled the budget of the commission for 1955-56. So this is an independent commission reporting to parliament through the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Mr. DINSDALE: It confines itself only to the battlefields?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To Quebec City battlefields.

Mr. DINSDALE: And battlefields elsewhere would come under the Historic Sites Board?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The Historic Sites and Monuments division of the National Parks Branch of the department.

Mr. DINSDALE: I suppose the possibility of amalgamation is pretty remote?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, I believe it was two years ago that the hon. member for Quebec south, Mr. Power suggested the abolition of the commission and that the battlefields in Quebec should be administered, as are all the other historic sites, by the Historic Sites division, but this is still under consideration.

Mr. DINSDALE: That would seem logical.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The money which was supplied for the purchase of these battlefields came from other countries, from some of the provincial governments of Canada and also from individuals with the understanding—because it was known at the time—that they would be administered by an independent commission; so you realize what the situation is.

Mr. CANNON: On that point, I think that as a Quebecer I should protest any suggestion that the battlefields commission should be abolished. It has been doing a good job for a great many years and I think the situation is satisfactory.

Mr. THATCHER: What grounds does the commission look after?

Mr. CANNON: They are the grounds where the battle of the Plains of Abraham was fought. The minister has just explained that all these grounds were bought by funds supplied by individuals and by governments outside and inside Canada, and also by some other countries which were then inside the empire and this money was given in trust. The lands bought with this money and the income, if there is any left, are administered by the National Battlefields Commission.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As a matter of fact, one of the members of the commission is appointed by the provincial government.

Mr. DINSDALE: That is a technicality.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You can discuss with Mr. Duplessis whether this is a technicality or not.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are there not members of the Historical Sites Board who are appointed from the provinces, too?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is quite different. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board does not administer any historic sites. The board has the duty of advising the department on the historical value of historic sites of Canada. It advises whenever there is a request that some particular historic site should be marked as such or that a monument be erected, or that a property should be bought. I never act without the advice of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board whose responsibility it is to advise me on these things.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are there any moneys left in the trust fund?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This was a fund set up for the specific purpose of purchasing the grounds in Quebec and maintaining them. The moneys have been expended a long time ago, and in the last 40 years the grounds have been maintained through a vote of the federal parliament each year. But the capital value is still there, and it was supplied by the federal government, in part, and by all those others whom I have mentioned, collectively.

Mr. MONTEITH: The general effect is that the National Battlefields Commission is a quasi-independent commission?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is and it reports to parliament through me.

Mr. HARKNESS: Now I would like to ask a question on another point. There are five new administrative assistants shown here. Does this mean there has been a change in the setup of the department.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Three of these administrative assistants were appointments made in order that junior officers might be given the opportunity of developing experience so that they may take over senior posts in the future. It is really a matter of developing recruitment and looking towards future responsibilities. They are posted to various branches of the department for experience and training.

Mr. HARKNESS: Was it not felt that there was anybody in the department capable of coming along to fill these posts?

Mr. ROBERTSON: It was felt that those available were probably not equal in number to the responsibilities and requirements we could see coming up in the next few years.

Mr. HARKNESS: Just as a matter of curiosity, I notice last year there was a private secretary and an assistant private secretary. What labels would they carry this year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It was my predecessor, I suppose. I do not know what his setup was.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where would your private secretary be listed?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have no private secretary. I believe his title is "executive assistant." I have an executive assistant and a special assistant whom I have on loan to my office from one of the divisions of the department.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why it is not in the vote under administration?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. He comes from the lands branch and he is on loan helping me in liaison work with the various branches of the department. This is very necessary because of the great amount of administrative work involved in my office.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I still really have not had an answer as to why this increase appears in the number of clerks, stenographers and secretaries in this breakdown.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have the increases here. My deputy minister will now go over the list.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Does your question relate to the 14 on the administrative staff?

Mr. HARKNESS: No. It relates to the increase in the number of clerks, secretaries and stenographers only.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the administrative branch?

Mr. HARKNESS: In this particular section, departmental administration which we are dealing with.

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think it would be simpler if I went over the complete list. In the deputy minister's office there is one additional departmental accountant class 10 appointed to review departmental forms and procedures and to make recommendations for simplifying and reducing the number of the forms; that is a temporary appointment for a year or possibly less. There is one additional administrative officer grade 3. That is temporary to provide for a person who is now on loan to the United Nations. There are three additional junior administrative officers who are for the future promotions I mentioned before. There are two additional stenographic positions which are really to provide stenographers for two positions which were filled last year, a second assistant deputy minister and the executive officer of the department. That covers those which are found in the deputy minister's office proper. The purchasing division has one additional typist, and one stenographer has been added to deal with the increased load of purchasing in connection with the work in the north. In the personnel division four clerical positions have been added to meet the increasing work as a result of the public service Superannuation Act. It is now necessary to handle superannuation matters for a large number of temporary personnel. In the editorial division there is an increase of 3, and in the economic division an increase of 1 economist grade 5 to deal with economic studies relating to the north. That covers the increase in the central administration.

Mr. HARKNESS: About half the increase in clerks then is due to the change in superannuation?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Four, yes.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would tell us what the government policy is as far as staff is concerned in allocating it between the north country itself and here in Ottawa? In other words, do you attempt to keep as much of your staff as possible in the Northern Affairs Department in the north, or is most of it here?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: My deputy looks after the matter of personnel and I think perhaps he should answer the question.

Mr. ROBERTSON: As far as the territorial administration of the Yukon is concerned most of the administration of the Yukon is actually in that territory. In the case of the Northwest Territories the territorial administration, the civil service if you like, is provided by the department in Ottawa for things like personnel, preparation of legislation for the territorial council, recommendations, compensation material, health grants, and arrangements, and all that type of thing. Then, as far as the division of other functions is concerned, it is simply a distribution between head office and field depending on what the requirements are. The warden's service is in the field in the north, in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, for wildlife, but the central administration of it is in Ottawa. The same with the mines, we have mining inspectors and a staff in each of the territories in the north, but the policy and general records are maintained for the most part in Ottawa.

Mr. THATCHER: What would be the rough proportion of your northern affairs staff which is in Ottawa as compared to what you have in the north? You do not have to be exact.

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think the figures as of February 28 for this year, as far as the northern administration and lands branch are concerned, give 142 as the total in Ottawa and 83 as the total outside of Ottawa for civil service positions. In addition to that there would be, in the Yukon, the Yukon administration proper which is not shown in those figures. Added to those figures there are 138 prevailing rate positions which are in the north. So that the total northern figure would be roughly 221, and the Ottawa figures would be about 142.

Mr. THATCHER: The 221 you mentioned would include people working in the park up there and things of that kind, so is it a fair statement to say that the bulk of your administrative staff is here in Ottawa?

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think probably that is a fair statement for the Northwest Territories but not for the Yukon.

Mr. THATCHER: In some of these other Arctic countries they seem to feel that if they can keep their staff close to the area they are administering they can conduct it more efficiently. Would there be difficulty in following such a policy in Canada? In other words, if there were more of our people in the north would they be better acquainted with the problems and be able to do the job more efficiently?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I draw your attention to the fact that because of the size of the north we have three districts, the Mackenzie, Keewatin and the Arctic islands. I do not see how any officers who are in the Arctic islands would go to report to Fort Smith in the Mackenzie district which is the administrative centre. It is much simpler to report to Ottawa. I do not see how our people in Keewatin would report to Fort Smith. They would report to Ottawa which is much simpler.

Mr. THATCHER: I cannot agree with you. Would they not be closer to their job?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are much farther from Fort Smith than from Ottawa if they are in the Keewatin, and there are no communications whatsoever between Fort Smith and the Keewatin or the Arctic islands.

Mr. THATCHER: I am not suggesting that there should be. I am suggesting that perhaps they should be in the town from which the member of the Northwest Territories comes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is Yellowknife, and it is not near the Keewatin or Arctic islands and there are no communications.

Mr. THATCHER: If your staff administering the territory would be living there would they not be coversant with the problems?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are a lot there. There is an administrator for the Mackenzie district who reports to the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories who is my deputy minister. The administrator is in Fort Smith and he has his staff there.

Mr. THATCHER: I cannot agree with your answers so I guess there is no use arguing.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I tell you that in order to have a full administration at Fort Smith you would have to—

Mr. THATCHER: I do not suggest that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What do you want exactly?

Mr. THATCHER: I am just wondering—I could be wrong—but it seems to me we might be more sensible if we had more of the administrative staff in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory where the actual job is being done.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Let us understand this. The Commissioner of the Yukon lives and works in Whitehorse and has his staff with him in Whitehorse, and has his staff in the other cities, towns or districts of the Yukon. But, as I have explained in the House many times, the Yukon has reached a stage of development which the Northwest Territories have not yet reached. In the Yukon the distances are not as huge as they are in the Northwest Territories. What I can foresee for the future as a political development for the Northwest Territories might be—I am not saying that it is going to happen but this is the way I envisage it at this time.

It might very well be that we would have to separate the Mackenzie district from the Keewatin district and the Franklin district and have it as an entity on the same basis as the Yukon, and have a fully elected council for it. Then we might have at the same time more of the administration in the Mackenzie district, as we have more of the administration in the Yukon.

Political and administrative development is a gradual process. We are tending to give more autonomy on the political as well as on the administrative side to the territories. Our ultimate goal is to grant them provincial status.

But in order to reach the point of provincial status we have to go at the political and administrative development gradually as conditions warrant. That is our policy and that is the course we are following. Our aim is to do exactly what you have in mind, Mr. Thatcher, and as conditions permit, to give more and more administrative and political autonomy to the territories.

You may rest assured that nothing is farther from my mind, or from the policy that my officers are following, than to try to retard the political development, and I might as well include economic along with political, as well as administrative development of those territories. With my officers I am doing whatever I can to further it as quickly as possible.

Mr. THATCHER: I was just wondering at the fact that as so much of the administrative staff was here in Ottawa, possibly they have never had an opportunity of visiting these northern areas and cannot be acquainted with them. Would it not have been more effective if they lived there? That is all.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The people in our northern administration branch are sent to occupy posts in the north, and they are brought back; there is a circulation and an exchange of personnel, so that our people in the northern branch do have some experience in the north.

Mr. THATCHER: I have one futher question: will the minister state what the policy of his department is with regard to putting Eskimos or Indians on his staff? Have you many natives on your staff?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That will be shown when we study the details of the estimates with respect to the northern administration. You will then see that we have made provisions for five Eskimos to be trained as assistants to our northern service officers.

Mr. THATCHER: Are there any here in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am told that we have provision for two in the Arctic division.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you any specific policy in your department with respect to the hiring of Indians?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes; but would you mind if we kept that question until we got to northern administration? Then I will give you the whole policy and what I call the human problem. It is quite complicated and I would have to cover a lot of ground. It seems to me that we might as well keep to departmental administration. I am just suggesting it, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to dictate anything to the committee; but it seems to me that it wold be a more orderly way of doing it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the committee would appreciate it. If any question could be better answered under some other heading, they would not mind your saying so.

Mr. SIMMONS: In regard to the filling of administrative positions, and positions in the Yukon, it has been the policy of the department, it seems to me, to fill them all by means of transfer from Ottawa or from the Northwest Territories to the Yukon. Thus we have a lot of bright young people in the territory who are feeling slighted because they did not get an opportunity to fill some of those positions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: These are civil service positions and there is no reason why people from the Yukon should not apply. They are not barred from applying for those positions and competing.

Mr. SIMMONS: When a position becomes vacant there, you generally fill that position by means of a transfer from Ottawa or from the Northwest Territory along the Mackenzie. The young people up in the Yukon are not getting a chance to have such a position because they are filled here by transfer. It is right here where you have your five administrative assistants being trained.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Why would the young people in the Yukon not apply for those positions?

Mr. SIMMONS: Because they would not have an opportunity.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Surely they have an opportunity. All positions available in my department are advertised in all the post offices throughout the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. We make sure that they are.

Mr. SIMMONS: There are a lot of cases in which the positions are filled by transfer.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You brought up the example of the five young administrative officers, and I am answering you on that point.

Mr. SIMMONS: Surely you could give consideration to the local inhabitants.

Mr. HARDIE: With respect to those five positions of which Mr. Simmons spoke, would they have to be advertised and publicized in the Yukon, or are those positions open here in Ottawa where you will train people to send them north? Has the Civil Service Commission been advertising such positions here in Ottawa for a certain area?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, no. It is not done in all cases. In the case of these "administrative officers" positions that you have taken as an example, there was a competition open to anyone in Canada. That competition was advertised throughout all the Northwest Territories as well as the Yukon and across Canada.

Mr. HARKNESS: I wonder. Without having special reference to those five administrative officers, but just referring to all the positions, particularly those in the field in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories, as well as administrative positions here, and dealing with them, do the residents of those areas have a geographical advantage, such as is the case with a large number of positions in the civil service, as far as the provinces are concerned?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, not in our department. Take for instance the case of the national parks. I believe there is a great advantage in not having the superintendent of a park chosen from that region or even from that province. I believe our experience has been that there is a great advantage in moving such people around in the field from one post to another. The advantages in doing so are first, in order that they may acquire experience, and second, since they are in positions which require them to make decisions, it is better that they be there for only a limited time.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is a geographical preference as far as the large number of positions are concerned in the civil service. But apparently as far as the Yukon and the Northwest Territories are concerned, such geographical preference does not exist in making appointments?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It does not exist in our department at all.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think it does, however, as far as the Park Wardens are concerned. I am quite sure it exists.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If it is a new position—say in the Yukon where there is an administrative office—if it is a new position, for which we require a clerk or a stenographer, clearly there is a regional preference.

Mr. HARDIE: You are speaking of new positions opening in the north?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: With respect to the five positions of administrative assistants, can anyone from your department tell us if those positions were definitely advertised, or if they were advertised in the Yukon or the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said that they had been. The five administrative officers are not especially trained for the north. They are trained to occupy various positions in the department. It might very well be that one will go to the water resources division, another to the national parks branch, or another to the travel bureau. It is to have a reserve, as the deputy minister has explained, of well trained administrative officers, as we can foresee a great number of retirements in the next few years.

Mr. HARDIE: I am sorry, Mr. Minister. I thought that the deputy minister's explanation was that the purpose was to train them here for positions in the north.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not especially for the north. One might go to the north, one might go to the lands branch; and I do not know how they will be divided. It is just to train them for future administrative jobs.

Mr. SIMMONS: In one instance at least, people were available in the Yukon to fill a certain position, but the position was filled by an applicant from Edmonton.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What was the job?

Mr. SIMMONS: I forget now; I shall have to look it up.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is difficult for me to comment if you do not know what job is involved.

Mr. HARDIE: With regard to the question of whether the hiring is done here or in the north, there was an instance last year where an applicant in the Northwest Territories applied for a warden position. He had to pay his own way from Yellowknife to Edmonton to appear before a Civil Service board. I doubt very much if one of those men on the Civil Service board knew anything about trapping. I think that the department should insist that the Civil Service, when filling positions like that, should have on the board someone with experience in hiring personnel who would be adaptable to that part of the country or those positions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe that wardens are in a special category; we have to shift them around.

Mr. SIMMONS: Recently there was a vacancy for a civilian position in the Department of National Defence, in the Stores Branch, and there were several applicants from Whitehorse, but I understand that the applications were sent to the Civil Service in Edmonton, and they selected a man from Edmonton and paid his fare all the way to Whitehorse. I understand that after two years they will pay for the transportation of his family and furniture and everything. Yet we had people in Whitehorse who could not find employment. I do not see that that is fair.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe, Mr. Simmons, that these representations could be properly addressed to my colleague, the Secretary of State, to whom the Civil Service Commission reports, or to my colleague, the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. THATCHER: We are very much interested in that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: How should I know who is appointed as an accountant for the Department of National Defence?

Mr. HARKNESS: As a matter of general policy, you say that you do not have any preference in any of the jobs.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I corrected myself, and said, when there is the opening of a new position.

Mr. HARKNESS: Apparently that is the idea that has been generally in your mind, from the statement which you made to begin with. I would think that that is a basic difficulty. I think that there should be a regional preference so far as these positions are concerned, because there is no doubt that many of the people who have been up in the north all their lives know the conditions very well and would therefore be better able to fill these positions. Those people are at a disadvantage in getting these jobs because of the fact that they have not had as great an opportunity for schooling and so forth. Nevertheless, as far as the actual carrying out of the job is concerned, as a result of having been brought up in the north and knowing the conditions, they can really do a better job than someone who has been living elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: One is either an accountant or one is not.

Mr. HARKNESS: Therefore I think that these two areas are areas where the regional preference should have quite a strong effect on the appointment.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I say that I am glad that we have had these representations this afternoon. I shall look into our policy in this matter, and might I assure the members of the committee that we shall do whatever we can to abide by the wishes that have been expressed this afternoon.

Mr. HARDIE: Anything which I have said about this matter is in the way of a suggestion to the minister, and I think that he can do something about it. Where they are hiring for positions in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, they should be sure that man from your department or the Civil Service Commission is there who knows something about hunting or trapping. I think that the board should be set up in Yellowknife and not in Edmonton, so that these people do not have to pay their way there and back.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I say that, as far as the warden service is concerned, I shall look into the matter. If you would give me the instance and the date when that happened, we shall take it up with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HARDIE: I do not have a particular case. I say this with regard to all this hiring. I am sure that you, as minister of this department, can instruct the Civil Service Commission that a man who knows something about the job for which they are hiring is going to sit on that board.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Six of the more important jobs in the Northwest Territories are the six new positions that have been created within the last year and which are now filled, for Northern service officers. Among the six, three are from the Northwest Territories.

Mr. HARDIE: I will say that in that case the Department of Northern Affairs held the board in Yellowknife, and they came out with pretty good men.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Thank you.

Mr. HARDIE: I hope that the department carries on in that way and so instructs the Civil Service Commission, if they are going to hire for the Department of Northern Affairs.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is one point of view. This will be taken up with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THATCHER: Would you state how many of these six men you mention will live in the north?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They will all live in the north and they will have Eskimo assistants.

Mr. DINSDALE: I am interested in the Advisory Committee on Northern Development. What is their function, their duty?

Mr. ROBERTSON: The Advisory Committee on Northern Development is an inter-departmental committee with representatives, generally the deputy ministers, of the departments primarily concerned with northern work, national defence, transport, public works, the commissioner of the R.C.M.P., the Deputy Minister of Finance and several others. It is quite a large committee. The purpose of the committee is to co-ordinate policy with regard to the north. The positions in the department to which reference has been made are to provide the secretariat for the continuing operation of that committee. It meets once a month, it has six sub-committees which meet regularly and this is the operating secretariat.

Mr. HARKNESS: What do you mean "this is the operating secretariat"?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Dinsdale referred I think to three staff members designated as for the Advisory Committee on Northern Development. That was last year. This year the secretariat is included in the new vote for the Northern Co-ordination Centre.

Mr. HARDIE: This is included in this new section?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: And on that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he would not keep his eye on the branch. We have got the Research Council, we have fisheries research and branches of all the departments who are doing service in the north and I would like to warn the minister to keep his eye on this and not let it get out of hand because there is a tendency when someone is made chief of a branch to like to see a big staff under him.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are there any research personnel on this advisory committee or is that function separate?

Mr. ROBERTSON: That coordination centre will have, in a sense, two aspects. It will in part carry on the work of the secretariat of the Advisory Committee on Northern Development. The second part of its work will be to operate as a central information centre for information relating to the north.

There is a great deal of research that is being done regarding the north. Mr. Hardie has mentioned several, the fisheries research branch does some, National Defence does a great deal of work, National Research Council is doing a lot of work on the methods of construction in permafrost and methods of insulation and construction in the north, the Defence research board is doing work on conditions relating to the north—clothing, things of that kind. There is no place at the present time where these things are brought together, there is no central point where you can go to get all information of this sort. Now, this centre will provide that. There may be a few cases where there is no work done by anyone, as I said this morning, but for the most part this centre is not for the purpose of doing research but to coordinate the results of research.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any research done at the present time at this centre?

Mr. ROBERTSON: It has just been established. It has not done anything yet.

Mr. HARKNESS: I agree with Mr. Hardie that I don't think we should have a multiplicity of these research centres. We seem to have a lot of them already and it would seem to me that any research that is going to be done could be done much more cheaply by one of those already established—National Defence research, Fisheries research, National Research Council or by a university staff.

Mr. ROBERTSON: That may be the case and our purpose would be when that could be done to have it done that way. There is $10,000 included in this vote for grants to university personnel or to other organizations that can do particular types of work that are wanted. There is also provision for two seasonal positions, if we wish to get people for a summer season of work on a particular project, but there is no continuing research position provided for in this vote.

Mr. Harkness: I presume that perhaps the major portion of the research which you would want done in the Northern Affairs would be economic?

Mr. ROBERTSON: And sociological, social research, the problem of adjusting Eskimos from a hunting society and primitive economy to, say, employment in a mine community such as Rankin Inlet on the shores of Hudson bay. This involves very real problems—just the basic ones of learning to live in wooden houses in one place instead of snow houses moving over the country, including the ordinary hygienic problems. Also the adjustment to a regular way of life —keeping fixed hours, and so forth. These all create social problems.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is there any contact between this advisory committee and the Arctic Institute of North America. Apparently they carry on extensive activities in the north, particularly in research.

Mr. ROBERTSON: This vote includes an amount of $5,000 for the Arctic Institute. The person who will be the chief of this section is a member of the board of governors of the Arctic Institute.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 294?

Mr. HARKNESS: What about transport here in Ottawa for this department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Two cars and three trucks.

Mr. HARKNESS: What do they use them for?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The trucks are for the department's mail—two trucks are for mail—and one is used by the forest products laboratory.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about the two cars?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will have that matter looked up. You are satisfied with the explanation about the trucks? Two are for the mail of the department, and one is for the forest products laboratory. As you know we occupy 14 buildings here in Ottawa. We are pretty well scattered.

Mr. HARKNESS: Those various branches have a certain amount of transport also?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the total in Ottawa. All the others are in the field and we will be ready to answer all questions about them when we get to the various branches and divisions.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about those two cars?

The CHAIRMAN: I am dealing with section 294. We can carry section 294 I take it?

Mr. HARKNESS: This is on 294.

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is 293. Can we carry 294?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, what is the answer about the two cars?

Mr. CARTER (*Departmental Administration officer*): There is one car for the forest research division, mainly used in local research out of Ottawa. This is used in the field to provide transport between Ottawa and Petawawa where the forestry experimental station is located. There is a second car used by the National Parks branch here in Ottawa. It is not used for Ottawa transportation, but for investigations of historic parks and historic sites and also some of the national parks close to Ottawa, such as the St. Lawrence Islands.

Mr. HARKNESS: The reason I asked this question really is that I see there are no drivers or chauffers provided for here, and I was wondering who drove these vehicles.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have drivers for the two mail trucks.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where do they appear?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are classified as clerks, I am told.

The CHAIRMAN: We have 15 minutes. I wonder if we can turn our attention to engineering, Water Resources branch, to give an idea to the officials of that branch to the sort of questions we are going to expect them to answer when we meet again. We are leaving item 293 without carrying it, and moving to 305. The officials of the department have been waiting here all the afternoon, so if we can start on their branch and indicate what we are going to require, I think we should be taking the best course.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to ask a general question. I do not see in the estimates any general item, but on page 414 of the estimates there is a provision:

> To provide for a contribution to the cost of constructing a dam on the Conestogo river near Glen Allan, Ontario, for the purposes of flood control and water conservation . . .

I wonder if we may have a word on this? Will the sum of $1 million set down here be enough to complete the project?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh, no, far from it. The federal government entered into an agreement dated the 15th of September, 1953, whereby the government will contribute 37½ per cent of the estimated cost of $5,400,000 for the construction of the Conestogo dam and the maximum contribution by Canada will not exceed $2,025,000. The province of Ontario is responsible for the remaining 62½ per cent of the cost of construction. Last year there was a vote of $1 million for this, but due to delays we do not believe that more than $135,000 worth of work can be completed by March 1955, of which the Canadian government's share would be approximately $50,000. But we expect in the coming year our share of the work that will be done will amount to approximately $1 million.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would the minister care to comment on any further considered work at this time on the Fanshaw dam and the upper Thames valley?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe at this time I can say I have the briefs which were presented to me sometime ago from the upper Thames authority, from the Humber valley authority and from the Moira river authority. I still have these briefs under consideration and as soon as the government has reached a decision I will make an announcement in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on item 310?

Mr. GARLAND: On projects of that nature covered in item 310 the initiative must of necessity come from the local area?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of necessity the request to us must come from the provincial government.

Mr. GARLAND: It is a 3-way proposition, local, provincial and federal?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. If the province is ready to pay 37½ per cent, which is the same amount we are ready to pay, and the local authorities 25 per cent and if all the conditions that are set forth under the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act are filled, then you can have a project like this.

Mr. GARLAND: It would be initiated locally?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Usually yes.

Mr. GARLAND: And worked out with the province?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, and the briefs which I receive do come from the province.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: But the work is done under the supervision of the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but it is inspected by our officials.

Mr. MCBAIN: Is this project on the Conestogo river the only one which the federal government is contributing to at the present time?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MCBAIN: These other projects like the Upper Thames valley are completed?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, no. As I said the briefs which I have received from the provincial government a few weeks ago are still under consideration and as soon as the government has reached a decision as to its possible participation I shall announce it in the House. I hope it won't be too long.

Mr. MCBAIN: I see that the provincial government has approved a project in the sum of $5,550,000 for the Humber river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is one of the briefs which I have in front of me for consideration now.

Mr. MCBAIN: Your contribution will be the same as theirs?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The contribution of the federal government would be 37½ per cent of the cost of the project as approved by the federal government. There is nothing to prevent the province from spending more, if they wish to. I do not know. According to the Act the federal government will not spend any more than the province; but as to whether the province is going to spend more, I do not know, and I cannot say.

Mr. GARLAND: Is there any provision for giving assistance to local authorities—I mean technical assistance—in developing a proposal or proposition?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. We do not.

The CHAIRMAN: Does item 310 carry?

Mr. HARKNESS: $1 million was voted last year, and $1 million again this year; and the fact is that only $143,000 has been spent. What is the reason for that? Why has only such a small proportion of the work been done?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I know. I will give you an explanation.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to be one of those items which keeps reappearing in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: When the estimates for the fiscal year 1954-55 were passed, it was expected that the main contract for the construction of the Conestogo dam would be let early in that fiscal year. The town of Paris, Ontario, appealed the proportion of the cost assessed against it by the Grand River Conservation Commission, to the Ontario Municipal Board, which did not render a decision until nearly the end of 1954, with the result that the main contract was not let until late in February, 1955. So we had nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. HARKNESS: You now anticipate that this development is finally going to be accomplished?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The contract has now been awarded.

The CHAIRMAN: The item is carried. Now, item 305 "Branch Administration"; the details are to be found at page 409. Are there any questions on it?

Mr. MONTEITH: There is a drop of two in the personnel, which probably is a good thing. How is that accounted for?

Mr. JACKSON: The reason for that change is that one administrative officer, Grade 7, was transferred from that unit to the Northern Administration branch, and one stenographic position was dropped. That accounts for the change.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would that stenographer be transferred?

Mr. JACKSON: The stenographic position was vacant, so it was just dropped for that period.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice in the report under "Water Resources Division" that it says that the primary function of the division is the acquisition, analysis, and publication of stream-flow and run-off data covering the whole of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: What page is that?

Mr. HARKNESS: Page 61. If that is the basic function, I would ask what proportion of the personnel is employed in this whole branch which runs to quite a considerable number, six or seven or eight hundred people, and perhaps more than that are engaged in that primary function. It seems to me that the majority of them are engaged in other activities than that, such as the investigation of the Columbia river basin.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I would point out that this comes under item 306. The Engineering and Water Resources Branch is really divided into two: the Water Resources Division and the Engineering Division. Might we finish with the Branch Administration before we go to the Water Resources Division?

Mr. HARKNESS: As long as we can ask any questions with regard to this Water Resources Division. I do not want to be told later that I should have asked this before.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We shall certainly remember it. It plays an important part and we shall be pleased to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN: "Branch Administration" only covers fourteen positions, and the estimates are for $54,283.

Is that carried?

Carried.

We now come to item 306, under which Mr. Harkness was asking about administration, operation and maintenance.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
306	Administration, Operation and Maintenance, including grant of $350 to the International Council, World Power Conference	410	725,819	669,597	56,222	

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Could I ask Mr. T. M. Patterson, who is the Director of the Engineering and Water Resources Branch, to answer Mr. Harkness' question?

Mr. THATCHER: It is 5.30. If it is a lengthy one, perhaps we should adjourn and leave it until tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it a long answer? Then we will adjourn, gentlemen, until tomorrow at 3.30 p.m. in room 497.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 16

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson and Mr. M. Lamontagne, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. T. M. Patterson, Director, Engineering and Water Resources Branch; Mr. H. I. Nicol, Administrative Assistant to the Director, and Mr. J. D. McLeod, Lake of the Woods Control Board.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55833—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McBain
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Simmons
Thatcher
Yuill —26

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

THURSDAY, March 24, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Michener be substituted for that of Mr. Monteith on the said Committee.

Attest.

Leon J. Raymond,
Clerk of the House.

55833—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 24, 1955
(20)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Garland, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, MacEachen, McBain, McLeod, Power (*St. John's West*), Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson and Mr. M. Lamontagne, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. T. M. Patterson, Director, Engineering and Water Resources Branch; Mr. J. I. Nicol, Administrative Assistant to the Director, and Mr. J. D. McLeod, Lake of the Woods Control Board.

Copies of the "Annual Review of the Water-Power Resources of Canada and their development to the end of 1954" were distributed to the Committee.

The Committee resumed the consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Engineering and Water Resources Branch, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Agreed,—That a table showing "Available and Developed Water-Power in Canada at the end of the year 1954" be printed. (*See Appendix 'D' to this day's proceedings*).

Items numbered 306 to 309 inclusive and 311 were adopted.

At 5.20 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Friday, March 25.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

MARCH 24, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen. I see a quorum so we shall proceed. We are on item 306, under the water resources division. Administration, operation and maintenance. Details are on page 410.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Before Mr. Patterson answers Mr. Harkness' question, may I, with your permission Mr. Chairman, suggest that members of the committee should be supplied with a document which I have in front of me now. It is entitled "Water Power Resources of Canada". It is an annual review of the water power resources of Canada and of their development as achieved to the end of the year 1954. I thought members of the Committee might be interested in that document. I will ask Mr. Patterson, now, if he would answer Mr. Harkness' question.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON (*Director, Engineering and Water Resources Branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question asked by Mr. Harkness at the close of yesterday's meeting, it is my understanding that data are desired to show the breakdown of the Water Resources Division establishment as between employees actually engaged on hydrometric work and those engaged on other activities of the division.

The total establishment of the Water Resources Division is 742. This number includes 102 positions assigned to the Columbia river investigation, which is a temporary undertaking. Of the remaining 640 positions, 609 are assigned to and utilized in the hydrometric survey activities. It should be noted that of the 640 positions, 500 are for gauge readers, which are part-time positions. The gauge readers time varies from five minutes to two hours per day.

On a percentage basis 95 per cent of the positions in the continuing establishment of the division or over 80 per cent of all positions, including the Columbia vote, are utilized in the hydrometric survey activities. That is my answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many of these people who are permanent employees are engaged in administrative duties as compared with the number of those engaged in field activities?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What exactly is your definition, Mr. Harkness, of "administrative duties" because there are quite a number of engineers in Ottawa who are doing work in the office which is not exactly administrative work. These engineers are studying the reports which we receive, and also they are people who will, for instance, be studying the applications we shall receive under the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act. It is difficult to determine whether they are administrative or engineering positions, because the people who study these problems have to be engineers.

Mr. HARKNESS: I would say these were essentially engineering positions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Engineering and technical you mean, then.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On one side exclusively administrative and on the other side, engineering and technical?

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, let us have it on that basis.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Nicol who is administrative assistant to the director of the Water Resources branch will give you the number and description of the administrative positions in the head office. What page of the blue book do you find that on?

Mr. J. I. NICOL (*Administrative Assistant to Director of Engineering and Water Resources Branch*): On page 410.

Mr. CARTER: There are very few positions which could be considered as in the category of administrative officers. The majority of the positions are for stenographic assistants and clerical assistants and it is not in this form broken down just for head office in Ottawa because the engineers in the field also have stenographers to help them in the various offices across Canada.

Mr. HARKNESS: What I was trying to get at is this: is a fairly large proportion of your personnel engaged in purely administrative duties or are the majority occupied in actually working out the development of our water resources?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Carter has just answered that question. He told the committee that the only positions which could be considered purely administrative are those of the clerks and stenographers who work for the engineering and technical staffs, and they are not very numerous.

Mr. CARTER: There is only one administrative officer position. The remainder are clerical and stenographic positions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is only one administrative position in the whole office.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder whether the minister or one of his officials could outline for the committee just what the duties of this water resources division are?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: With pleasure.

It is the investigation and national inventory of water and power resources of Canada; investigation and study of international waterway problems; the measurement, with provincial cooperation, of stream flow throughout Canada for power, irrigation and other purposes and the administration of the Dominion Water Power and Irrigation Acts.

The basic function of this division is to carry out a continuing systematic and uniform survey of the surface waters of Canada for water resources development purposes in their federal, international, interprovincial, and, in cooperation with the provinces, in their provincial aspects. To this end more than 1,000 gauging stations are maintained and operated throughout the country. Gauge readings are made regularly by gauge readers. On stations where gauge readers are not obtainable or the sites are not easily accessible and where a continuous record is desirable, water-stage recorders are installed; these number about 194 and are visited periodically by the technical staff.

The expanding national economy has emphasized the fundamental importance of water as a national resource and has dictated the need for better assessment of this resource by systematic expansion of the existing hydrometric survey coverage, particularly in the northern areas where only meagre data are available to meet the requirements of industrial growth and an expanding population. This need forms the basis for the selection of sites for installation of additional gauging stations; and the division endeavours at all times to examine and assess requests for additional stations from the viewpoint of the value to the nation of the information that will be obtained, prior to improving such expansion in the program set forth in its annual estimates.

Operations are carried out from six district offices located at Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Montreal and Halifax, with 11 sub-offices at White Horse, Y.T.; Kamloops, B.C.; Cranbrook, B.C.; Nelson, B.C.; Revelstoke, B.C.; Prince Albert, Sask.; Keewatin, Ontario; Fort Frances, Ontario; Niagara Falls, Ontario; North Bay, Ontario; and St. John's, Nfld.

Mr. THATCHER: What is a gauge station?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a station where you gauge the volume and the flow of a river or of a stream.

Mr. HARKNESS: By gauge you mean measure?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is measuring the level—the speed of the flow and also the volume of the flow.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder whether the minister would care to comment on the announcement made this afternoon about this new atomic station. Is that going to render obsolete any of these hydro projects?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The answer is "no" because hydro power as far as we can foresee would be cheaper than atomic power.

Mr. THATCHER: Is that in the immediate future, or over a long period?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the foreseeable future.

Mr. THATCHER: So far as this announcement went this afternoon, we are still going to need hydro power.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Definitely. I cannot foresee in my lifetime or in yours, Mr. Thatcher, that, for instance, atomic energy will replace cheaper hydro power in the electro process for metals.

Mr. THATCHER: But it would be of advantage to provinces where there is no hydro.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If there is a limited amount of cheap hydro power you might supplement it with atomic power and then have an average price which will be at a reasonable level. We are supplementing our hydro power with steam-produced power. The steam-produced power costs more, but you get an average which is reasonable.

Mr. THATCHER: I should hate to think we are continuing to spend vast sums of money on this kind of development if atomic plants are going to render it obsolete.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I would like to answer that in this way. You can see what is going on in the United States. They are trying there to develop their hydro power by all possible means. For example the possibilities of the Columbia river are immense for cheaper power, and it cannot be foreseen that atomic power can replace this cheap power.

Mr. THATCHER: But, Mr. Minister, I have seen statements made by American scientists who foresee that this atomic power may eventually be cheaper than hydro power.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, as to that—

Mr. THATCHER: Anyway, not in the foreseeable future.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: According to all the information I have—I am not an expert, but I have been pretty well informed on this. I do not believe that in the foreseeable future we can expect atomic power will replace water power.

Mr. MCLEOD: In connection with this work which is being carried on by the engineering and water branch—is this being carried on strictly in cooperation with the provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What kind of work do you mean? The hydrometric work?

Mr. MCLEOD: Our power surveys.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The hydrometric work, yes.

Mr. MCLEOD: Do you recognize the authority of the provincial governments or do you have any special powers under federal Acts?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It all depends. For hydrometric surveys of rivers which are strictly provincial we work in cooperation with the provinces at the request of the provinces. We are doing the work for the provinces and the provinces pay a share. They reimburse us, so it is evident that they are more than informed of what we are doing.

Mr. MCLEOD: More specifically British Columbia. Is the British Columbia water rights branch recognized as the authority over the waters of the province?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not get what you say.

Mr. MCLEOD: In British Columbia, is the British Columbia water rights branch recognized as the authority over the waters of the province?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is a branch of the department of the British Columbia government, I understand.

Mr. MCLEOD: Yes, it is what they call the water rights branch.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I understand that they are licensing the works. We are not talking about works, we are talking about hydrometric surveys now.

Mr. MCLEOD: What I have referred to, more than anything, was item 308.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are on 306.

Mr. MCLEOD: Well, this comes under administration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, I have asked for the cooperation of members of the committee. This is one of the dangers of shifting from one item to another. There is the risk of misunderstanding.

Mr. SIMMONS: From what the minister has just told us, there appears to be provision for readings at the new gauging station in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS: Do the estimates contain a sufficient amount to cover winter readings for next year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The answer is "yes".

Mr. SIMMONS: Is it true that the Northwest Power Industries who have been investigating and surveying water power potential in the Yukon territory and northern British Columbia in the past few years, have been contributing money for winter readings?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Part of the money.

Mr. SIMMONS: Why should they be obliged to pay any further costs for these readings when this appears to be a public service.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: I think the answer to that is that the Water Resources division as a national body does conduct those services which are considered to be in the national interest in a broad sense. We have never undertaken to go in and operate all the gauges for each company which is desirous of developing a particular site, and in connection with the Northwest Power Industries Limited, we discussed the matter with them and arranged between the two interests a coordinated program under which the federal government put up the money for operating those stations which were considered essential to the area regardless of the particular development which the company had in mind. The company paid us additional funds to take care of specific problems in the development of that site, and that would seem to be a reasonable arrangement.

Mr. SIMMONS: What is the percentage of funds which they have contributed toward the total cost which is estimated?

Mr. THATCHER: Would that be the amount at the bottom of page 411?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: It would be less than 10 per cent.

Mr. THATCHER: Is that the amount shown under "revenue" at the bottom of page 411?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The bottom of page 411?

Mr. HARKNESS: Page 411.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This includes the revenue from all the provinces. Do you want a breakdown into amounts received from the provinces?

Mr. THATCHER: No, but I would like just to know what this revenue is.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is the share paid by the provinces for this hydrometric survey which is conducted by the Water Resources division of my department.

Mr. THATCHER: Do they only pay 10 per cent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no, that answer was in respect of Northwest Industries. The percentage which the provinces pay varies from province to province, and we are trying at the present time to make it more uniform.

Mr. THATCHER: Do they pay one-third, one-half, or one-tenth?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It varies. Quebec for instance pays 50 per cent—in fact, 50.6 per cent. I believe they are the highest. It goes down to 17 per cent, but that is being corrected.

Mr. THATCHER: Why the difference in rates?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has grown up over the years. In certain instances there has been a big increase in one area or in one province because of a sudden need for power surveys in that province, and it always takes some time before you can get a province to increase its share.

Mr. THATCHER: So if you have a $1,000 survey, the province of Quebec would pay $500?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That has been the experience for the last year or so.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have been given to understand that the Northwest Power Industries have expended well over half a million dollars in that investigation into the water potential of the Yukon and British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are investigating a possible diversion from the Yukon river to the Taku river and a lot of that sum represents engineering. It is not concerned only with hydrometric readings or services.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am sure you will agree that every encouragement and consideration should be given by the department to assist them in their endeavours in respect to the proposed northern development scheme.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes. When officers of Northwest Industries Limited applied for a survey licence, they came to see me. I assured them at the time that our water resources division would do its utmost to help them by an increased tempo of these hydrometric surveys in northern British Columbia and the southern Yukon. This has been done according to the assurance which I gave them, and it is still continuing.

Mr. SIMMONS: Are you prepared to say how far the proposed project has advanced?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have no recent information. The last information I had was given to me on a confidential basis.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the activities of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act administration, as far as the prairies are concerned, they seem to deal with matters which are very similar to those with which the water resources branch of this department has to deal and I wondered what tie-in there was between the two, what overlapping there might be, or what integration of their activities might exist?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The function of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation division of the Department of Agriculture is really to look after the works. We have the hydrometric survey and we supply the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation division with our survey data, which are necessary in order to know what kind of works they are going to build.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act people apply to you for information in regard to the water resources in a particular area, do they, and then they base their plans upon the information which they secure. Is that the relationship between the two departments?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: With respect to water information, yes, but not with respect to soil information; but on water readings, yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is the water we are talking about. I noticed on page 68 of the report you have something there about the Waterton and Belly rivers engineering board, and the St. Mary and Milk river board, both of which are concerned primarily with the P.F.R.A. in building dams for irrigation purposes and so on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The water sheds you are talking about have been under reference to the International Joint Commission, and the work done by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation division has been based upon recommendations of the International Joint Commission, which recommendations were arrived at after our engineering people had worked very closely with the International Joint Commission.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes. As I understand the answer, your department or the water resources branch of your department is only tied in with the P.F.R.A. to supply technical information?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, directly, or in certain cases it is done through the International Joint Commission. Our technical people provide technical assistance and engineering assistance to the International Joint Commission; and the reports of the International Joint Commission with respect to Canadian water resources are based on the engineering and technical data that are supplied by the water resources division of the department.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as construction of the St. Mary's dam is concerned, do you supply the engineers who provide the expert advice on that question, or do you have anything to do with it at all?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was done before my time. But Mr. Patterson might give you an answer.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON (*Director of the Engineering and Water Resources Branch*): Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, the water resources division does not take any part in planning such projects as the St. Mary's dam. It was planned by P.F.R.A. itself. The water resources division, however, does have a continuing program, and as that program is worked on they supply the P.F.R.A. with the results of it; and based on its water survey results, the P.F.R.A. plan their projects. Mention has been made of the St. Mary's and Milk river. They were treated by the two governments under treaty; and the water of those streams was divided between the two countries. It is the function of the water resources division to see that the division is made in accordance with the terms of the treaty, and to ensure that P.F.R.A. or any other interest takes no more than their share of the water.

In regard to the Waterton-Belly Rivers Engineering Board, to which mention was made, that subject is under review by the International Joint Commission. Mr. Gordon MacKenzie, the chief engineer of P.F.R.A., and two officers of the water resources division are the Canadian members of the

engineering board which is studying that problem for the commission in order that recommendations may be made to governments as to the division of the flow of those two rivers between the two countries.

Apart from that, the water resources division has no part in the development of the dams, or of irrigations structures which are incorporated under those plans.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as the St. Mary's project is concerned, I presume from what you said that you have a resident engineer there to measure the flow which is going into the irrigation scheme at the dam, and if that flow should exceed a certain amount, you would issue orders that they must cut it down.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: In essence that is the way it works. We have engineers operating from our Calgary district office and they are circulating through that southern Alberta area all the time making measurements in different irrigation districts and in different rivers in order to insure that the terms of the treaty between the two countries are observed.

Mr. HARKNESS: I see at the top of page 62 of your report it says:

> In addition to its routine hydrometric operations, which were expanded during the year, the staff of the division was called upon to carry out a large amount of special investigatory work, particularly in connection with the Columbia River, the international prairie rivers...

What does that consist of, so far as international prairie rivers are concerned? Of course the Columbia river is a separate item.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: In answer to your question, what I have just stated with respect to the Waterton-Belly is part of the answer. These rivers are under reference to the commission and we are doing the special surveys for the commission, and special measurements. Similarly in connection with the Souris river which rises in Saskatchewan, flows into North Dakota and then back into Manitoba, including the various tributaries of that river, we are doing the surveys on all these streams to give—first the board of engineers and then the commission—the information with which the waters of those rivers may be divided between the two countries to the satisfaction of both governments.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): On page 2 of the report I was wondering if the figures in columns 2 and 3 included the potential of the Hamilton river? I refer to the table on page 2.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The answer is no.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Do those figures include the potential of any of the Newfoundland-Labrador rivers?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, according to my information they would not include any of the Labrador rivers.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): That percentage is much higher than the rivers on the island.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, I believe so; but I do not believe that the potential of the Hamilton river is yet known accurately. We are making some hydrometric surveys of the Hamilton river at the present time in conjunction with the British firm known as "Brinco".

Mr. SIMMONS: That is rather peculiar to me. With respect to table 1, British Columbia ordinarily has a flow of 7 million and 23 thousand as against the Northwest Territory with a flow of 382 thousand 5 hundred. Could that be explained so that I could get an idea of where the difference is?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have no Columbia river in the Yukon. You must remember that.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is right. That is the power potential.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. It is the power potential, not accounting for possible diversions.

Mr. SIMMONS: So I see.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: As far as Quebec is concerned, are these figures established by your department, or are they given to you by the Quebec government? I refer to column 2.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am drawing Mr. Patterson's attention to your question.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, the figures in column 4 with respect to the province of Quebec are checked with the provincial authorities through our district office in Montreal. The figures in columns 2 and 3 are not professed to be the ultimate figures for the province of Quebec for the reason that there are many northern streams of which we do not have the flow-information in order to develop power data. The power figures on what we term the ordinary minimum flow and the ordinary six months flow, take several years of records to develop; so that in Quebec and in various other provinces which are listed there, the final figures will be considerably larger than those shown. We have endeavored to be conservative in the use of figures, and we use only the ones for which we have got definite flow data and definite data of available heads.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Am I to presume that all these figures are worked out in conjunction with the provinces from time to time?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: We have complete cooperation with the province of Quebec in our stream measurement work, and any data which we develop from our stream measurement work.

Mr. SIMMONS: Do the figures with respect to turbine capacity in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories listed at 32,440, do they include the Mayo Hydro Electric plant and the Snare river plant at Fort Smith?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not Fort Smith, it is diesel at Fort Smith. It is the Snare, and Mayo plants.

Mr. SIMMONS: What capacity has the Mayo plant?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Three thousand horse power; that is the unit in the Mayo plant at the present time.

Mr. SIMMONS: Is there any likelihood of that power being increased in the near future? I do not like to put Mr. Robertson on the spot.

Mr. THATCHER: Why not ask him about the Saskatchewan river too?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister*): That is a matter which is under discussion at the present time with the United Keno Hill Mines which is the principal industry in the area and the principal user.

Mr. SIMMONS: I had better shut up from now on.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On pages 6 and 7 of your mimeographed report forecasts are made for the amount of turbine capacity in 1955. Have you the total for that? I could work it out for myself but it would take a little time. Is the total available?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have some total figures at the bottom of page 5, Mr. Churchill:

> In 1954, all records for the amount of new hydro-electric generating capacity brought into operation in Canada during a period of one year were broken when capacity totalling 1,758,450 h.p. was completed. This may be compared with the previous high year of 1952 during which 1,066,250 h.p. was brought into service.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I see that; and on pages 6 and 7 where you are dealing with each province, have the figures been totalled, as a matter of interest?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am informed that the rough total for 1955 is 1 million horse power.

Mr. THATCHER: I noticed that the department pays certain expenses in connection with the controlling of the Lake of the Woods level of water.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Is that a special item?

Mr. THATCHER: It is on page 411.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we go to that, we have had questions asked on table 1, so we shall put table 1 just as it is in the record as an appendix. Is that agreed? Agreed.

(Table 1—see Appendix "D")

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Thatcher had a question about the Lake of the Woods and our arrangements with Manitoba on the Lake of the Woods. Well, we have with us Mr. J. D. Mcleod who is the acting chief of the water resources division. He is a member of the Lake of the Woods control board, so maybe we should ask Mr. Mcleod to give the explanation.

Mr. J. D. MCLEOD (*Acting Chief of the Water Resources Division*): Mr. Chairman, the function of the Lake of the Woods control board is in connection with the operation of the Norman dam and the outlet of the Lake of the Woods, and the regulation of the lake as an international boundary water. Two-thirds of the cost is recovered from the province of Manitoba under the terms of the agreement of 1931 under which the natural resources of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta were transferred from the federal government to the governments of those respective provinces.

Mr. THATCHER: What is the purpose of it?

Mr. J. D. MCLEOD: To provide storage for power use both at the Norman dam as well as downstream at all the Manitoba plants on the Winnipeg river.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you a similar arrangement with any other province along the same line as that of the Lake of the Woods, or is that a special case?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was done before my time. The reason we have an interest in that board, and in these works, is that these works were undertaken when the federal government had control and ownership of the natural resources in the western provinces.

Mr. THATCHER: That is the only case though which you have?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is also international, I am informed.

Mr. J. D. MCLEOD: With respect to Lac Seul in the same water shed there is a similar arrangement between Canada, Ontario, and Manitoba; and it is part of the same operation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have no other similar case.

Mr. THATCHER: As far as your department is concerned, you do not enter into any agreements with the provinces actually to develop the hydro. You just do the survey work, and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS: What is the total cost of this Mayo plant, and the one on the Snare river, just roughly?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I shall refer your question to the chairman of the Northwest Territories Power Commission, who is my deputy minister.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: The Mayo cost was approximately $4 million, I believe. Yes. The Mayo river power plant had a cost of $4,306,000; and the Snare river power plant cost $4,615,000.

Mr. SIMMONS: What is the capacity of that Snare river plant?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: It is more than that of the Mayo plant. It is 8,350 h.p.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, it is more than the Mayo plant.

Mr. R. G. Robertson: It is considerably more than the Mayo plant. The Mayo plant includes the basic construction for the second unit to which Mr. Simmons referred to a moment ago, which would bring the power up to something over 6 thousand horse power.

Mr. SIMMONS: And that is ammortized over what period of time?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Twenty years.

Mr. SIMMONS: Has there been any consideration given to increasing the period of ammortization in order to assist the mining companies?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Yes, consideration has been given to it, but it would require the approval of the federal government to enable it to be done.

Mr. SIMMONS: But it is still under active consideration?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS: Thank you.

Mr. HARKNESS: In connection with the run-off on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, at the top of page 65 it says:

> ... in the South Saskatchewan and Oldman river basins, extreme floods occurred in June with peak stages exceeding previous records. There was considerable damage to farms, bridges, and to the lower lying sections of the cities of Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Saskatoon, but not of catastrophic proportions.

What are the reasons for that? Are there any plans to prevent such floods as these, or any suggested remedies?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: I think that the reason for the flood in that particular year was simply that it was an act of nature, the precipitation and the collection of snow in the foothills, and the manner in which it came off in the run off.

With regard to whether there are any plans to prevent it in the future, this department has not made any plans to develop a reservoir, or other measures with which to hold back the water.

Mr. HARKNESS: I believe that they had the highest water on record at Medicine Hat, and I think also at Lethbridge and Saskatoon at that particular time. A good deal of damage was done. I do not think that the snow was any heavier in that particular year; in fact, it was not as heavy as it has been in many other years. That is why I wondered if there was any particular cause for this flood, which you people might have learnt from your study of these matters. Was it the result of a greater denudation of the forest cover?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: I do not think that the reason can be put down to the cutting down of the forests. Flood run-off in rivers is not dependent entirely upon the amount of precipitation or the amount of snow. There are several factors that enter into the rate at which the precipitation will come off an area. One, of course, is the amount of snowfall there. Another is this: if there is a cool spring, and you suddenly strike hot weather, the snow from the mountains and the foothills will come down in large volume. Even with a lesser amount of snow in the foothills you can have a greater flood on the prairies, owing to the fact that the lesser amount has melted in a shorter space of time and it comes down in a big flood.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, this is one of those things about which nothing can be done.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The forces of nature.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think that Mr. Patterson was going to make some answer.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: We are always battling with nature. There may be measures which can be taken to alleviate some of that, but it is not the function of the water resources division to develop those measures. We are concerned with measuring the stream flow and giving the people information on the amount of water which they have to contend with.

Mr. HARKNESS: I presume that your snow surveys, with which you deal on the next page of the report, are for this purpose? You state that snow surveys were made in the St. Mary's river basin and in the Bow river basin. Are those surveys chiefly of the snow in the mountains?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: That is correct, sir.

Mr. CHURCHILL: With regard to run-off conditions, the report is, of course, for last year. Are you in a position to bring it up to date now, as of March, 1955?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: The question is a general one. Our operations are confined to certain basins in the country. We do not conduct snow surveys all over the country, but in those basins in which we do conduct them—the St. Mary's river being one of them—we are in there because of the international nature of the river and the desire to conserve and divide that water between the two countries. Right at the moment, I cannot give the prediction for this summer, although some of the data will be in our office in the district.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On the question of the run-off, I think that you did mention a minute ago that the purpose of making surveys of this nature was to inform people who are interested. Who are the people who are interested? What is the reason behind this? Why make these surveys and publish this information? Who requires that information, and what use is made of it? For example, on page 65, you speak of the prairie run-off and you mention the Assiniboine river and the Red river. Is that information available to people in Manitoba who are concerned with possible flooding of the Assiniboine or Red rivers?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Any information which we obtained in Manitoba and in the Lake of the Woods watershed in the Ontario portion, is turned over to a committee in Manitoba. That committee does give out information as to the possibility of flooding in Winnipeg or on the Red river or the Assiniboine river.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The information at this time of the year is now in the possession of that committee?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: That is right.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It is available to them?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Yes, sir.

Mr. YUILL: I am particularly interested in the Pembina and Athabaska rivers. Over a period of years, in 1942, 1944 and 1948, and again last year, they had rather excessive flood conditions. Before I left home they had a mass meeting of all the property owners, particularly around the Pembina, for the purpose of trying to get some co-operation from the government. I do not know whether it is solely a provincial responsibility or not; I should like to get the answer to that. But the purpose of that was to try to set up some measure of flood control. The provincial government at that level made quite an extensive survey, but I was just wondering if that is a strictly provincial responsibility to provide flood control, such as dams. That was done with a two-fold purpose: flood control and water conservation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a question of policy, Mr. Yuill. The responsibility for flood control is provincial but there exists a federal act which is called the

Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act, under which, if certain conditions are fulfilled, it is possible for the federal government upon the request of the province to contribute up to 37½ per cent of the cost of conservation works which involve flood control.

Mr. YUILL: That is the point I wanted to get cleared. Assuming that other things are equal, I take it that it is deemed to be advisable to set up a unit to control flood conditions with dams which in turn lend themselves to water conservation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, there has to be economic benefit.

Mr. YUILL: That would be by mutual agreement between the federal and provincial governments and the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, the usual pattern is that the local authorities provide 25 per cent, the provincial government 37½ per cent. If the provincial government comes to us and tells us that the local authorities are ready to proceed to the extent of 25 per cent and the provincial government to 37½ per cent, and if it is a major project which fulfills the conditions that are mentioned in the Act, then, on the advice of the technical officers in the department, I may recommend to the government the participation of the federal government.

Mr. YUILL: Thank you very much. At that meeting there were about seven hundred farmers—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You realize that I cannot discuss any particular case before I have a brief.

Mr. YUILL: My point is this, Mr. Minister, that they were just at a loss to know where to look for consideration. Would I be within my rights to suggest to them, when I go home at Easter—I know that they will be asking me about this—that that could be a possible solution?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, you could supply them with a copy of the Water Conservation Assistance Act and with a copy of the report of the committee, or the page which will contain our discussion.

Mr. HELLYER: Would the minister say whether he has received representations from the provincial government with respect to the Don and Humber rivers in the Toronto area?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have, and they are under very active consideration now. I am not ready to make any recommendation yet. That is not the Don; it is the Humber. I did not receive any brief from the provincial government about the Don watershed.

Mr. HELLYER: No representation has been made?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Only about the Humber. I had missed the word "Don".

Mr. MCBAIN: Can the minister give us an indication as to when he might have that report available?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For the Humber?

Mr. MCBAIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In a few weeks. There have been some questions about technical staff. May I say now that we are very short-handed in this division of my department. A tremendous amount of work is involved in these studies. We are increasing the staff on paper for next year, but it is very difficult to secure the services of engineers.

Mr. HELLYER: Has the minister any idea why no representations were made in regard to the Don valley watershed?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, I have no idea.

Mr. HELLYER: At the time of Hurricane Hazel, if the precipitation in the Don valley had been as great as in the Humber valley, the damage might have been much greater.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is difficult for me to read the mind of the provincial government of Ontario. I shall be as expeditious as possible. But again, while our Water Resources Branch has to deal with the levels of the St. Lawrence and of the Great Lakes because of the St. Lawrence seaway, while they have to deal with the levels of the Columbia river and all its tributaries because of the present need for complete data on that watershed, while they have to go along with all these surveys, at the same time they have to study the briefs, look at the economics, look at the engineering data they receive, and check the hydrometric surveys. That is one of the reasons it has taken more time than I had hoped it would take to reach a decision. But we are doing our best to secure the services of engineers.

Mr. MCBAIN: When you get storms like they have had in western Ontario, it spurs the people on a little more with regard to these matters.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I realize that, and I am doing my utmost to do it as quickly as possible.

Mr. MCBAIN: I notice that on page 65 it says: "Similarly, yearly run-off to northern Lake Huron and Georgian Bay was close to normal, although a new low record for November discharge was established on the Aux Sables river". Would that be for 1953?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I shall ask Mr. Patterson. You will realize that it would be practically impossible for me to have that at my fingertips.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: It refers to the year 1953-54.

Mr. MCBAIN: That would be in November, 1953, then?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mention was made on page 71 under "Federal and provincial boards and special investigations", of the Bow River Control Board. We have a great deal of difficulty, at Calgary particularly, over the formation of ice. It is stated here: "Close surveillance was maintained by the Calgary office over ice conditions on the Bow river near Calgary during the ice-forming period of 1953-54". I take it that this board is primarily for the purpose of studying these ice conditions which cause periodic floods throughout the watershed. Could you tell us what the board consists of and what its powers are?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not have before me the details of the board. It comprises members representing the city of Calgary, the Calgary Power Company, the Province of Alberta and, I believe, possibly more than one department of the Alberta government. We have on that in an ex-officio capacity our district engineer who is located at Calgary. He is primarily responsible for supplying that committee with hydrometric flow data and level data along the Bow river by means of which they complete their studies and predict the possibility of ice jams, and endeavour to devise some method of release of water through the power plants up-stream to ameliorate the effects of ice-jamming through the city of Calgary.

Mr. HARKNESS: Your part in this is purely advisory, is it?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: That is correct.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as the department is concerned, you have no powers in regard to this control of ice conditions? You cannot issue orders to the Calgary Power or anybody else?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: No, sir, our member of that board is an ex-officio member. He is there to give them advice on the flow and levels of the river.

Mr. HARKNESS: Then the next item that comes up there is the Prairie Provinces Water Board, on which I see that you have two federal repre-

sentatives. What powers does that board have in regard to the control of he interprovincial waters?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: The board comprises two federal members, one member from each of the three prairie provinces, a total of five members. One of the federal members is from the Water Resources Division and the other is from the Department of Agriculture and acts as the chairman. The board considers applications from different interests for the use of the waters of interprovincial rivers. For instance, an application was made to that board for the necessary water to supply the South Saskatchewan project. The board considered that application in the light of upstream and downstream requirements and made recommendations. Those recommendations are put into effect only by the governments of the three prairie provinces, and the federal government endorses the recommendation.

Mr. HARKNESS: It has to be unanimously endorsed before anything can be done?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: That is correct.

Mr. HARKNESS: So this board does not constitute anything in the nature of what you might call a prairie waters authority? It is simply an advisory body to the provincial governments concerned and the Dominion government?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: An investigatory and advisory body.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In the comment on the Red river basin investigation, at the bottom of page 71, mention is made of the report tabled in the House of Commons on November 27, 1953. What action, if any, has been taken as the result of that report with regard to flood control in the Red river basin?

Mr. PATTERSON: So far as I am aware, Mr. Chairman, no action has been taken to implement the findings which were contained in the report of that board which looked into the flooding on the Red river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a provincial responsibility, Mr. Churchill. It is not our responsibility.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was going to ask about that. The incentive rests with the province. What I am saying is that no resquest from the province has been made to you with regard to any action?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am sure of that because the report was issued on the day I was appointed to my present office, and since then I have not received any request for assistance.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): I am looking at page 62 of the report. In view of what is, for the size of the province, a large power development and the extremely large power potential in Newfoundland, has the minister considered establishing a district office in Newfoundland?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a sub-office there.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): I know. But I wonder if he would consider the suggestion I have made.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have not given this matter consideration up until now, but I will discuss it with my officials.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further remarks on 306? Then 306 is carried.

Item 307—the construction or acquisition of building works land or new equipment.

Mr. THATCHER: What would the new equipment involve?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of the $65,500 here, $38,000 is for the purpose of buying motor vehicles—40 replacements and 4 additional motor vehicles—for the purchase of 24 water stage recorders, which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, at a cost of $12,000. For British Columbia and the Yukon districts,

one new purchase and two replacements, for Alberta and Saskatchewan 5 new purchases and 5 replacements; for the Manitoba district one new purchase and one replacement; for the Ontario district one new purchase and one replacement; for the Maritimes district and Newfoundland 5 new purchases and 2 replacements. The purchase of 14 current meters accounts for $2,800; the purchase of 7 levels—surveying instruments—$1,800; the purchase of wire-weight gauges, $1,400; and general equipment, $9,500.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any further comment on that particular item? Is the item carried?

Carried.

The next item:—308 to provide for studies and surveys of the Columbia water rivershed in Canada.

Mr. THATCHER: Why should the staff of this department have come up from 74 to 102? I am referring to page 413 of the blue blook. Has it anything to do with the argument which the federal government has been having with the British Columbia provincial government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. There is no change in the basic program for 1955-56, from that provided for in the current year, except that a sum of one-quarter of a million dollars has been distributed among the following items—topographical surveys $100,000; drilling investigations $50,000; and other professional and special services, $100,000—to commence the determination of the feasibility of diverting water from the Columbia river basin to the Fraser river possibly via Eagle Pass.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you had any report on the feasibility yet?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no. The money is not voted. These diversion studies, amounting to one-quarter of a million dollars, account for 95 per cent of the increase in that vote.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder if we might consider the expenditure in some detail. I see an item: "Drilling investigations". What would that be?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We had better ask an engineer to tell you that. Mr. Patterson, would you tell Mr. Thatcher what kind of drilling is going on. I know it is to test the soil.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: In connection with this Columbia river investigation, we have to determine whether it is possible to build a dam at a particular site. The surface indications may be very good, but they can also be very deceiving and at each dam site we have to drill on the axis of the proposed dam on each bank of the river and in the river itself to determine where the rock may lie, and in that connection I may say that in many of the sites we have investigated in the Columbia and Kootenay valleys, with rock showing on both banks of the river, we have drilled in the river bed for over 200 feet without striking rock. There are deep glacial deposits in those valleys and the location of the rock determines the type of dam which you would build at any particular site and, of course, the cost of the structure; also, of course, it would determine whether or not the dam is feasible at a particular point.

Mr. THATCHER: I see, and the item above—topographical services—shows a substantial increase. Would that be for the same reason?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I mentioned that there was an increase of $250,000 in respect of the study of the feasibility of the diversion—$100,000 for topographical services, $50,000 in drilling investigation, and $100,000 for other professional and special services. We are pretty sure we shall have to go outside our department to have a good part of this work done under contract, for the reason which I have explained, namely the lack of technical staff.

Mr. THATCHER: Will this increase be likely to do this work?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We believe it is a beginning. We do not know exactly when it will be possible to give the answer.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is likely to continue for more than one year?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: I think with regard to the diversion study, this year's investigation could show that it was not feasible. In other words we could get enough information in the first year, in a negative way, to see that there would be no point in going any further. But if the information which we obtained this year were promising, and particularly if it were a borderline case, we would have to conduct further studies before we could actually determine whether this project was feasible or not, and then it would be quite likely we should need to continue for another year, or maybe for two years.

Mr. THATCHER: Is the reason you wish to divert this river—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do not at this time "want" to divert this river. It is not our responsibility for the present to do more than find out whether it would be economically feasible.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you want to divert it so you can use water which the Americans would otherwise use?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In order to regulate the flow of the Fraser river and have some power sites on the Fraser river which are impossible now.

Mr. THATCHER: Impossible on the Columbia?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On the Fraser. This is a project to divert water from the Columbia to the Fraser. There is no storage possible on the Fraser at the present time.

Mr. THATCHER: You are trying to divert water from the Columbia into the Fraser?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. But the storage would be on the Columbia.

Mr. THATCHER: I see.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It could be at Mica creek.

Mr. HARKNESS: And your dam sites would be on the Fraser?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The possibility would be that there would be a series of sites on the river.

Mr. HELLYER: Do you "pan" this gravel which is brought up during your drilling investigations to see if there is any gold? Have you come across any gold during these investigations?

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: No.

Mr. HELLYER: If you do, let us know.

Mr. HARKNESS: What "tie-in" is there with the International Joint Commission and the studies which they are carrying on as regards the use of this water as between ourselves and the United States?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On the possibility of the diversion? The whole watershed of the Columbia is under study by the Commission.

Mr. HARKNESS: What "tie-in" is there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If some of the waters of the Columbia were diverted to the Fraser, it would change the picture, at least at certain times of the year.

Mr. HARKNESS: It would, certainly.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, that is the answer.

Mr. HARKNESS: You can give no further answer? Nothing in more detail?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The existence of a diversion would certainly change the whole pattern on which the International Joint Commission would make its recommendations.

Mr. McLEOD: I think most of my questions have already been answered. As I understand it, there are two dam sites on the Columbia which have been approved, one at Murphy creek.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, the drilling is still going on at Murphy creek.

Mr. McLEOD: Mica creek is definitely approved?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, Mica creek is not definite yet. I am informed by Mr. Patterson that the division has received only enough information about the Mica creek site to determine that a dam can be built.

Mr. McLEOD: I just noticed a report from General McNaughton the other day that Mica creek could start immediately.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Physically, yes.

Mr. McLEOD: Murphy creek has not reached that stage?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, drilling is still going on.

Mr. McLEOD: And it has been definitely proved that you cannot build a high level dam in the vicinity of Castlegar.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, we did carry out drilling operations in the vicinity of Castlegar at two or three sites, and the findings were that it was not a suitable location for a high dam for power purposes. It may be a suitable site for a storage dam where you do not need to worry too much about leakage, but the sites around Castlegar did not prove suitable for a power dam.

Mr. McLEOD: As I understand it then, these estimates are based on legislation presently in force. This has nothing to do with Bill No. 3 if and when Bill No. 3 is put through.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has nothing to do with Bill No. 3.

Mr. McLEOD: At the present time, then, the supreme authority over the Columbia river is the British Columbia water rights branch?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I would not say that, because Mr. Varcoe gave an opinion in the External Affairs committee which is not the one you have expressed. I did, in the House, say that I considered works which would have an effect on property rights outside the province would not be works covered by section 92 (10) of the British North America Act because they are not local works in the province, and this opinion I gave in the House was confirmed by Mr. Varcoe, the deputy minister of Justice, in the committee on external affairs.

Mr. McLEOD: Speaking of these diversions for which you are voting money this year, that will have some effect on irrigation in the Okanagan, will it not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe that matter was discussed in the committee on external affairs and that Mr. Lamontagne spoke on it.

Mr. Maurice LAMONTAGNE *(Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources)*: I think Mr. Patterson explained on that occasion that there could be two different projects.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Yes, the suggested diversion of water from the Columbia river to the Fraser river is primarily from the point of view of developing large blocks of power in Canada. As a secondary issue it would be possible to divert part of the water from the upper sources of the Thompson across into the Okanagan where large areas of land suitable for irrigation exist, but where there is at the present time insufficient water to carry out such irrigation.

Mr. McLEOD: I happen to know that district quite well, and I am mighty interested. It is certainly intriguing to hear it said that there are possibilities of bringing sufficient water there for the irrigation of several hundred thousand

acres. But it will happen that the only way that that water can be diverted into the Okanagan would be over a height of land on which my hometown is situated, and it looks like a pretty far-fetched scheme. Of course, I am no engineer, but I was interested in that report according to which you could divert water without pumping into the Okanagan. It seems quite far-fetched to me, but if it could be possible to irrigate these thousands of acres, such a scheme would certainly be of wonderful benefit.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: We have made no study of the economics of the diversion of water into the Okanagan, and there has been no statement, may I say, that it could be done without some pumping being involved.

Mr. MCLEOD: Well, it was specially mentioned in the press that it would be done without pumping. That was the part which amazed me. Where they are getting their information from, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Patterson tells me our division has released no information to the press, so the information does not come from us. Maybe it comes from the Water rights division of the British Columbia government?

Mr. MCLEOD: No, it has come right from Ottawa, and those details were in the report.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, it did not come from our division.

Mr. HARKNESS: Does this study involve investigation of possible dam sites in the Fraser river system, or it is confined to the investigation of the feasibility of diverting water to that system?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It does include that.

Mr. HARKNESS: Has it gone far enough for the government to be able to say how much power would be developed on these Fraser river sites?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has not started, Mr. Harkness. The money has not been voted.

Mr. HARKNESS: Last year there was the sum of $408,000 spent on this.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not on diversion, Mr. Harkness.

Mr. HARKNESS: What was the study that was going on—I am referring to this sum of $377,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The Columbia river and its tributaries. You were talking about the Fraser river.

Mr. HARKNESS: No, I am talking about the Columbia river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You asked me a question. Your question, I believe, was: "Have any power sites been surveyed on the Fraser river?" And I said "No, because the investigation is not started yet." It is starting this year, and it is the first time money is being spent for this purpose.

Mr. HARKNESS: Well then, the first time money has been voted to study the feasibility of this diversion.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And at the same time, the possibility of sites on the Fraser river.

Mr. HARKNESS: Until there has been some survey and some fairly reasonable information that there might be some reasonable sites on the Fraser, the survey would never have started?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh, that is known. We have information that there are some possibilities, but they have not been surveyed.

Mr. ROBERTSON: The information is known in a preliminary way—that there is justification for spending this sort of money in this investigation if the economics of the thing are satisfactory. There are sites available.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is the very thing my question was addressed to—whether there was sufficient basis on which to justify the expenditure of this amount of money from the point of view of future power sites on the Fraser river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: British Columbia Electric Company have made some general surveys on the Fraser and they have made the results of those surveys available to us.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any estimate formed of the amount of horsepower which may be developed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, I believe there is.

Mr. HARKNESS: That was the original question.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If I gave an answer without warning you that the surveys have not been completed yet, members might be misled.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think we were slightly at cross purposes, and now the difficulty has been ironed out.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, there exists between the proposed point of diversion in the Columbia river and sea level some 1,300 to 1,400 feet of "head" which has a potential of development. We do not yet know how much water could be diverted from the Columbia without interfering with existing power plants and irrigation schemes on the Columbia in the United States, and until we know how much water we can divert, it is not possible to tell how much power can be developed on the Fraser by means of the diversion. There is a further problem on the Fraser in connection with the fish. Undoubtedly there will be some of that head of water which cannot be developed owing to the importance of fishing on the Fraser river. There are problems of highway and railway, as you probably know. The railways go right down the valley of the Fraser, and the highway also is in the Fraser valley, and to change this would cost large sums of money. Before we can determine how much of that head it is economically possible to develop, we have to have the results of these surveys and some indication of where we can build dams and how high we can build them.

Mr. HARKNESS: You have, however, an estimated figure, I think you indicated a little while ago.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: We do not have an estimated figure of the power which can be developed from the diversion of the Columbia water, owing to the fact that we do not know yet how much water we can divert, but there are figures for the existing flows of the Fraser river and the heads that exist on the Fraser. I do not have them right at my fingertips.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you any general idea of the extra power which might be secured from this diversion?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that it depends on many things, upon the amount of water they can get from the Columbia and, as is stated, on how high it is economically feasible to build some of these dams.

Mr. HARKNESS: Before the survey was undertaken, I think that there must have been some strong purpose that would justify that it be investigated at all.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can tell you that it is estimated that several billion kilowatt hours of additional power could be produced annually as the result of such a diversion.

Mr. HARKNESS: What does "several billion annually" mean?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If we knew, it would not be necessary to have a survey. If we know that it will be several billion kilowatt hours, we know it is certainly worthwhile to make a survey. It is impossible to give you the answers before the survey is made.

Mr. HARKNESS: I still think that there must be some general estimate, which is really all I am trying to get at.

Hon. M. LESAGE: I am informed that the best approximation is a figure of ten billion kilowatt hours.

Mr. YUILL: Would you encounter any flooding problems there by diverting into the Fraser? They already have considerable problems.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The purpose of any such diversion would be to release the water, which would be in the reservoirs, only at times of low water, to firm up the power possibility.

Mr. YUILL: That could be toned down to control it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would be definitely controlled. That would be the purpose of the reservoir: the control of the water and the release of the water.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is one other basic question. You said that we do not know how much of this water we may be able to divert, on account of the amount that is now being used by the United States.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there no basic treaty which governs that, so that we could have some general idea?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This has been discussed for four or five days in the External Affairs committee, this week and last week. If we start all over again it will take about five or six meetings to explain what the Treaty of 1909 is, what the international law is, how it has come about, and we will have to have here the officers of the Department of External Affairs and the Deputy Minister of Justice. I believe you will be highly interested in reading the report of the External Affairs committee.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am not proposing to go into any of those questions at all. I just asked one simple question, to which I think there must be some answer. That was: what basic rights have we as regards diversion? We must have some.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have the basic right to divert under article 2 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. If you want some further explanation it will take quite a long time.

Mr. HARKNESS: The matter of diversion is really a matter of the treaty between the two countries?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The only right that can be created by the diversion is the right to claim damages in the court of the country where the works causing the damages in the other country have been built. This is a unique situation in international law.

Mr. HARKNESS: Unless we had considerable rights of diversion it would be useless going ahead with these expenditures.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have definite rights of diverting, and if we do damage on the other side, the only right that the other side has is to claim damages in the courts of this country.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is the only point I was trying to bring out, whether the diversion justifies the expenditures.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is no doubt about the right to divert.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Item 309.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
309	Fraser River—Federal expenditures in connection with investigations to be carried out by "Dominion-Provincial Board Fraser River Basin".	414	127,750	165,000	.....	37,250

Mr. HARKNESS: Is that purely for investigatory purposes or only for the purpose of erecting the dykes on the Fraser and so forth?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is an investigation. It does not include the cost of any works.

Mr. HARKNESS: The Dominion government has paid a considerable amount towards those works, I think.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was before my time. I shall ask Mr. Jackson to answer that question. Mr. Jackson, you were assistant deputy minister.

Mr. JACKSON: I know that there was a joint agreement between the Province of British Columbia and Canada under which they shared in the cost of the Fraser river work after the flood of some years ago.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But that did not come under our department at all. We had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have these to do with floods, or also with the development of water power?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Also the development of water power.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any division of that figure as between the two purposes?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. The investigation serves both purposes at the same time.

Mr. HARKNESS: All I was wondering was whether this was chiefly to investigate the matter of these dykes that should be put in, and things of that sort, or whether it was purely to investigate the development of water power.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is for both. May I say that there will be very close co-operation between the Fraser river board in its survey with those that will be made by this division, so that there will be no duplication of the work.

Mr. HARKNESS: Does this work consist mainly in the measurement of stream flow and things of that kind?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Patterson is a member of the board.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: The work involves the study of possible reservoir sites throughout the Fraser river basin and particularly in the head water areas, which are for the most part entirely unsettled. Those investigations will determine what can be done in the way of flood control on the main stem of the river and will also indicate what waters can be stored for power purposes or release during the low water season. Other matters which are being studied include fluid erosion study in the lower Fraser river, and the matter of stream gauging, which you mentioned, sir, the improvement of the flow on the river for navigation, fisheries and the various other water resource uses.

Mr. HARKNESS: I take it from what you say that this is mostly concerned with the upper reaches of the Fraser, particularly in the matter of

provision of possible reservoirs, and dams, I presume, would be required in order to create those reservoirs.

Mr. T. M. PATTERSON: That is right, sir. The greatest possibilities for storage are in the upper regions of the Fraser and its tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it carried?

Carried.

Item 311.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
311	Engineering and Architectural Division — Administration, Operation and Maintenance..	414	336,487	438,868	.....	102,381
	Appropriations not required for 1955-56.....	416	.....	104,000	.....	104,000

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the other division of the engineering and Water Resources Branch.

Mr. HARKNESS: I noticed that the vote for this is down considerably and that the staff is down considerably. What is the reason for that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There has been a transfer from the Engineering Division to the Department of Public Works of certain responsibilities and certain personnel. For instance, the responsibility for trunk highways in the national parks, including one in which you are especially interested, the Banff-Jasper highway.

Mr. HARKNESS: The Department of Public Works has that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They have the Trans-Canada Division, and, with their experience in building highways, I believe it has been a wise move to transfer this responsibility for building trunk highways in the parks to the Department of Public Works. At the same time we have transferred part of the personnel.

Mr. HARKNESS: What does this particular branch do at the present time now that it no longer has any responsibility for roads?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For trunk roads. We still have the other roads in the parks, secondary roads, for instance. I shall give you some examples of roads which you know very well: the road going to Upper Hot Springs in Banff, the approaches to Banff. The Trans-Canada highway from Banff to Lake Louise will follow the south shore of the Bow river; but we will keep as a tourist road, the present highway between Lake Louise and Banff, and this will be still our responsibility; it will not be a trunk highway.

Mr. HARKNESS: What else does this branch do, besides dealing with roads in the parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Building in the north and building in the parks.

Mr. HARKNESS: Buildin what?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the parks?

Mr. HARKNESS: Either in the north or in the parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Building houses for the staff, schools, storehouses, the museum at Baddeck for instance, and various works for the National Parks Branch which includes the Historic Sites Division.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, this branch provides the construction end of all the various branches of this department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Exactly, that is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: If the Historic Sites Division want a cairn built, this is the branch that builds it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They plan it; the construction may be done under contract.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But the engineering and architectural work will be done in that division.

Mr. HARKNESS: In some cases they would do the building?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, by day labour. In the north we are trying to have as much as possible done by day labour to occupy the natives.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it carried?

Carried.

Mr. Minister, which do you wish to take now?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have ten minutes left. Do you usually stay after 5.30?

An Hon. MEMBER: No.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Is it the wish of the committee that we take the National Parks Branch tomorrow morning?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall meet again at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning. We shall take the National Parks Branch to begin with, and after that Northern Administration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I should like to take Northern Administration on Monday morning.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take the National Parks Branch tomorrow. Whether we complete it or not, we shall start with the Northern Administration Branch on Monday. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

APPENDIX "D"

AVAILABLE AND DEVELOPED WATER POWER IN CANADA

At End of the Year 1954

Province or Territory	Available 24-hours power at 80% efficiency—H.P.		H.P. Installed Turbine Capacity
	At Ordinary Min. Flow	At Ordinary 6-Months Flow	
1	2	3	4
British Columbia	7,023,000	10,998,000	2,246,868
Yukon & N. W. T.	382,500	814,000	32,440
Alberta	508,000	1,258,000	258,710
Saskatchewan	550,000	1,120,000	109,835
Manitoba	3,333,000	5,562,000	756,900
Ontario	5,407,000	7,261,000	4,845,486
Quebec	10,896,000	20,445,000	7,773,822
New Brunswick	123,000	334,000	164,130
Nova Scotia	25,500	156,000	170,908
Prince Edward Is.	500	3,000	1,882
Newfoundland	958,500	2,754,000	323,150
Canada	29,207,000	50,705,000	16,684,131

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 17

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS
AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson and Mr. M. Lamontagne, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director, National Parks Branch; Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director, and Mr. A. J. H. Richardson, Assoc. Superintendent, Historic Parks and Sites Division.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55900—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McBain
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Simmons
Thatcher
Yuill—26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, March 25, 1955.
(21)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Garland, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, McLeod, Michener, Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson and Mr. M. Lamontagne, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director, National Parks Branch; Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director; Mr. A. J. H. Richardson, Assoc. Superintendent, Historic Parks and Sites Division.

The Committee considered the 1955-1956 Estimates of the National Parks Branch, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Items numbered 295, 296 were considered and allowed to stand.

Item numbered 297 was considered and the consideration of the said item continuing, at 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m., Monday, March 28.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

55900—1½

PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, March 25, 1955.
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum gentlemen. We decided to take the National Parks branch this morning. The first item is No. 295.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I just say a few words on the organization of this branch. There is branch Administration which is covered by vote 295 and there are in fact in that branch of the department three divisions. The first is the National Parks and Historic Sites Services, the second is the Canadian Wild Life Service, and the third is the National Museum of Canada. May I suggest that the discussion of item 295 be of a general character and pertaining to the administration of the branch only. Questions relating specifically to one of the three divisions may be dealt with when we reach their respective votes. It seems to me it might be better if we proceeded along those lines, and when the reports of the discussions in the committee are published it will be easier for members of the House to follow the discussions which were held if they were conducted in an orderly manner.

The last thing I want to do is to dictate to the committee. This is a suggestion. Knowing the organization of the department, I suggest very respectfully that this procedure would make for a much more orderly discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I see that item 295 is a comparatively small one—$86,425—which indicates that the administration is divided up as the minister says. What we might do, I suggest, is pass from 295 to 296—administration operation and maintenance of the National Parks and Historic Sites Service—and go back to 295 when we have considered the other items.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can give some explanation of the increase there under item 295.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice there has been a 33⅓ per cent increase in the number of personnel.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what I wanted to mention. The National Parks and Historic Sites Services provided the services of a departmental accountant, Grade 10 to the branch administration. This position was subsequently transferred to the Administration vote of the department. As was mentioned yesterday the services of the incumbent of this position are considered necessary for the preparation of certain reports concerning all branches of the department. In order to offset the loss of this accountant a departmental accountant's position has been established to perform the duties formerly performed by the accountant and to undertake added duties as executive assistant to the director. A new position of supervising clerk has been established to supervise the accounts clerical section. Too new positions one clerk Grade 4(1); and one clerk Grade 2A have been created in order that a central property records system may be set up and maintained. That is an increase of two. These records will cover all equipment and supplies charged throughout the branch. There is a great amount of property and equipment in that branch of the department. A new position of clerk Grade 4 is to be established in order that twice-monthly wage payments may be made to prevailing rate employees in the Eastern National Parks and all National Historic Parks and Sites.

We have received representations to the effect that these prevailing rate employees should be paid twice a month instead of monthly. This is an additional position to provide for payments being made twice monthly in the Historic Sites section and for the Eastern Parks. As to the Western Parks I have also received representations from members to the effect that these prevailing rate employees should be paid twice a month.

Mr. THATCHER: How many are there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I finish my sentence, and I will answer your question. The representations were made by the leader of the C.C.F. party amongst others to the effect that they should be paid twice a month and we have made a submission to the Treasury Board in order to get two more clerks in the Parks Division to look after these bi-monthly payments in the Western Parks also. As to your question asking how many prevailing rates employees we have—

Mr. THATCHER: Employees who you want to pay twice a month.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The seasonal employees number 1,483. And there are a large number of full time prevailing rate employees.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you mean to tell me that you have to have an extra staff of two to make out pay cheques to them twice a month?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe the administrative officer of the department is in a better position to answer that question.

Mr. C. W. JACKSON (*Assistant Deputy Minister*): There is not only the question of calculating the pay; you have to take off the different insurance benefits, superannuation benefits and so on. There is a lot of bookkeeping connected with each man's pay.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Minister, what is the general policy in the civil service?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Payment twice a month, and that is why the representations were so strong—these people were an exception to the general rule in the civil service.

Mr. THATCHER: Why should they want to be paid twice a month instead of once?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You can ask your leader. He has been one of those who most strongly urged that these people should be paid twice a month.

Mr. THATCHER: There must be some reason. I suppose we cannot treat these people differently from the others, but it looks like a waste of money to me if we have to put extra staff on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They were the only exceptions, Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. HELLYER: Some people cannot afford to go for a whole month without being paid.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am told, Mr. Thatcher, that in the past payment to all civil servants including seasonal employees used to be once a month, but for a number of years we have been making bi-monthly payments, and this is the only remaining exception in our department.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose there will be some pressure now for weekly payments?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have not received any yet.

Mr. THATCHER: I think such pressure should be resisted if it does develop. I wish to go on record as objecting to this tendency. It is a waste of money.

Mr. HELLYER: I think it should be put on the record that, after all, these payments by the government are made in arrears, and there is no reason why the government should be financed by way of sums due to its employees.

Mr. THATCHER: They should not be paid in arrears, then. They should be brought up to date.

Mr. HELLYER: How would you do that?

Mr. THATCHER: I follow the point you are about to make.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose these seasonal workers are paid on an hourly basis.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Most of them.

Mr. MICHENER: And that type of worker is usually accustomed to getting his pay more frequently than once a month.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe so.

Mr. MICHENER: Where are these payments handled?

Mr. C. W. JACKSON: In the case of the maritime parks the pay sheets are made out locally and sent here, and the cheques are issued from here. That means sometimes a delay of 10 days before a man gets his cheque at the end of the month. In the western provinces the cheques are issued in the treasury office at Banff.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose these people are employed in relatively small groups in the national parks?

Mr. C. W. JACKSON: In the maritime parks, but not so much in Banff and Jasper. In Banff in the summer months, you might have more than 400 people employed at one time.

Mr. MICHENER: These people are not employed the year round?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not all of them.

Mr. MICHENER: Would it not be feasible in the case of this kind of labour—I see 855 are classed as labourers—to pay them locally in the same way as business firms would pay them, in cash, and keep local accounts for that purpose? That would save all the bookkeeping work which has to be done, the business of sending out the cheques from the head office, and so on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Cheques are not issued at Ottawa in the case of the western parks. In the western parks it is done in Banff.

Mr. MICHENER: I see, it is handled in Banff. That is what I was suggesting—payment on the spot as far as possible. If it were done that way the present staff could make the payments without the necessity of hiring additional people.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the eastern parks there are smaller numbers and we would have to increase the establishment of the local administration staff if that was done on the spot.

Mr. HARKNESS: These extra pay clerks are needed to pay this small number of people in the eastern parks?

Mr. C. W. JACKSON: There is only one at the head office to deal with the eastern parks and all the historic sites.

Mr. HARKNESS: What I was getting at was the figure you gave a while ago of the number of people involved in this payment twice a month instead of once a month.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: 1,483 is the whole number:

Mr. THATCHER: Two is the figure the minister gave.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the figure I gave—oh no, the two new additional positions have been created in order that a central property record system can be set up and maintaind. The new position of clerk grade 4 is being established in order that twice-monthly wage payments may be

made. Only one position is being established in connection with these twice-monthly payments. These two new positions are in connection with the establishment of the central property records.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you not had a central property record before this time—surely there was a central property record before this?

Mr. J. A. HUTCHISON *(Director, Engineering and Water Resources Branch)*: There has been no adequate central property record before.

Mr. HARKNESS: There was a central property record of some sort here in Ottawa, because if you wanted to get a lot in Banff you had to write in.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is another kind of property. We are talking about something different. We are not talking about land. That is handled by the lands division.

Mr. MICHENER: This is really an inventory of the equipment which the department possesses.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Equipment and buildings.

Mr. THATCHER: Your administrative staff is up 25 per cent as far as numbers go.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. THATCHER: That is a pretty sharp increase when you have still got the same number of parks. I am not sure that it is justified by what you have said so far.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, it was a very small number for a large administration, and any increase on a small staff is always a bigger percentage than on a large one, and we felt that the central administration—the branch administration—was really inadequate and we wanted to have a proper record of all our property throughout Canada in the national parks and in the national historic parks and sites.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to me that it is part of the general tendency, which we mentioned in respect to the increase in administrative staff, of constantly piling up which I think should be resisted rather than encouraged.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Whenever some property disappears, as you know, the government is blamed, and we felt after examining the situation very closely that we could improve this check on our property in the national parks branch. In order to keep this check we have to have adequate records and we are taking the means to do it.

Mr. THATCHER: It is a pretty expensive means.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is certainly less expensive than an insurance policy.

Mr. MICHENER: Could you give us an indication of the total value of the personal property and buildings which are in your inventory at the present time?

Mr. JACKSON: We have the figures indicating the total expenditures in each park over the years since the park was established. That consists of expenditures on buildings and road principally.

Mr. MICHENER: The buildings are not likely to be runaway with. The great problem is the removable, or personal, property. Can you give us an idea of the property in that respect which the government has under control?

Mr. JACKSON: Approximately $15 million.

Mr. MICHENER: That is quite an item of removable property. I suppose it is scattered throughout the park.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Historic sites and national parks from Newfoundland to the Pacific coast.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the system of economic check on that property?

Mr. K. M. TURNER (*Executive Assistant to the Director of National Parks*): An inventory is prepared by each of the parks at the end of December in each year which is forwarded to Ottawa and back checked against the records we maintain and any items which are missing they have to account for. Occasionally there is a fire pump, for instance, missing and we bring it to their attention; they have to locate that fire pump. Or there may be missing hose; they may account for 10,000 feet of hose and we have an entry showing 12,000 feet of hose.

Mr. MICHENER: I am interested to know whether there have been any serious losses?

Mr. JACKSON: I think we have been fortunate so far in not having any very serious losses.

Mr. MICHENER: You do not have to take action against people who get away with park property?

Mr. JACKSON: We have had odd instances over the past 20 years of a man stealing something from a garage, but I do not think such instances would occur even once a year.

Mr. THATCHER: If that is so why is an expenditure of $25,000 justified for checking up?

Mr. JACKSON: Where do you get that figure of $25,000?

Mr. THATCHER: I thought that was the figure the minister gave.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. There are only two clerks for checking up; one clerk grade four and one clerk grade 2A. The rate for the clerk grade 4 is about $3,000 a year and for the clerk grade 2A about $2,000 a year. I am giving figures which are on the maximum sides; that is about between $4,500 and $5,000 a year.

Mr. HELLYER: Would you mind giving the grades of the clerks again, please.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Grades 4 and 2A.

Mr. THATCHER: What is the $6,540?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To provide for the services of the Corps of Commissaires at the Norlite Building in Ottawa. This was provided for in the estimates of the Department of Justice, we occupy the Norlite Building and this is transferred from the Department of Justice, so it really is not an increase of $6,540.

Mr. HARKNESS: In connection with this business of providing a central registry and two extra clerks to look after it in Ottawa, I cannot see how that safeguards these buildings, motor and other equipment, anymore than the system you had in effect. In addition to these two clerks it means, of course, you have to have other clerks in all the national parks scattered across the country making up returns to send into these two fellows at Ottawa and you will have a proliferation of paper work as a result of that.

Mr. JACKSON: Following the passing of the new Financial Administration Act there was a tightening up in the question of government stores and the Treasury Board issued very strict regulations as to how it should be kept. That is why we have to have the extra staff in Ottawa. We have to make more returns to the Treasury Board on the equipment and stores we have everywhere.

Mr. THATCHER: This goes back to a demand of the Treasury Board.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To make sure that there are no losses. This goes back to certain losses which have occurred.

Mr. MICHENER: In other places.

Mr. HARKNESS: I take it that this is all a result of the Currie report.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not know, but certainly following the Currie Report there has been some tightening of the regulations. We should not hide that information; it is true.

Mr. MICHENER: There is great scope for loss of property when you have $15 million of loose property lying around.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This covers a lot of small equipment.

Mr. THATCHER: What would the duties of the librarian be?

Mr. Hutchison: The librarian is responsible for the maintenance of the library in the Norlite Building which serves the branch. The two divisions in the Norlite Building, that is the national parks and historic sites. You will understand that in the historic sites the library is most important for reference, also the library for the Canadian wildlife service which again is a technical and scientific service. The librarian also is responsible for the overall supervision of the library maintained in the Langevin Building and in the Vimy Building, one is for the Northern Affairs and the other for the department.

Mr. THATCHER: This library is mainly technical and scientific?

Mr. HUTCHISON: Technical, scientific and historic.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Specifically for the purposes of the branch.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not for the use of the public?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MICHENER: Generally, about how many volumes are in the library?

Mr. HUTCHISON: They are busy cataloguing the historic sites library now so that cannot be answered.

Mr. THATCHER: I note that there are 43 separate libraries maintained by various departments. Would it work to your disadvantage in your department if it were amalgamated with a central library?

Mr. HUTCHISON: Oh yes. There would not be any advantage to us to have a central library. The divisions and branches are scattered in 14 buildings. The wildlife and historic sites services are in the Norlite Building and there is a library for both in spite of the fact that the two are in the same building. Those sections as you can imagine are quite different. One is historic and the other is scientific.

Mr. HELLYER: Would you like a nice new building in which to consolidate your divisions?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HELLYER: Have you made your wishes known to the Minister of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have.

Mr. THATCHER: What place do you stand on the timetable?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not sure that we are even on the timetable.

The CHAIRMAN: We will leave this item for the moment and go to the "National Parks and Historic Sites Services".

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I draw your attention to the fact that "construction or acquisition of equipment" is under vote 297. When we get to 297 I intend to give a complete list of all the projects, first in the historic sites section, second the expenditures for the construction of trunk highways including bridges; and third, the projects in each park, in order that we have a good discussion which will be orderly. So I will ask your cooperation to delay any questions on construction of buildings, works, and purchase of equipment, but I will be delighted to discuss any other subject relating to the parks.

Mr. THATCHER: Have you a figure giving the total amounts of rents you are paying out for these 14 buildings in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do not pay rent. They are Department of Public Works buildings, and the Department of Public Works pay the rent where there is a rental.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does the fact that the national parks and historic sites services are classified together in the estimates mean they work closely together; do the functions of the personnel overlap?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is an historical sites section and Mr. Richardson is the head of that section. He reports to Mr. Coleman who is the head of the division. You see, there is a national parks and historic sites division. The head of this division is Mr. Coleman and the head of the historic sites section is Mr. Richardson who reports to Mr. Coleman. Some of the administrative and engineering services are common, but all the other services are separate. The accounting services come under branch administration.

Mr. DINSDALE: Apparently it is a policy in the development of historic sites to establish regional museums eventually. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, I wouldn't say that.

Mr. DINSDALE: I do not know where I picked up that idea. Does the work of the national monument and historic sites include digging up Indian relics and so forth?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. That comes under the museum.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be under vote 304?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. DINSDALE: So actually the functions of the national historic sites branch do not extend back into the period of Indian occupation on this continent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They might mark them. The research work is done by the museum people and is reported to the historic sites and monuments section.

Mr. DINSDALE: What, in the case of Indian excavation, happens to the artifacts and so forth which are uncovered?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Dr. Alcock will be here when we get to the museum and I think you will obtain much more satisfaction from the answers when he is here. He will be here when we reach that vote. The museum is, as I said, a division of this branch.

Mr. DINSDALE: Perhaps that will be better.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I think you will be much more satisfied with his answers in this specialized field.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no specific questions on administration we can pass to item 297 and perhaps cover the specific items there, and then go back to administration afterwards. Would that be all right?

Mr. HARKNESS: All right.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we shall take item 297—construction or acquisition of buildings, works, lands and new equipment.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I would like to give an outline of the details of construction projects.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about item 296?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should pass on and take the individual items and then go back to it afterwards. It seems to me that with this department there is a tendency to get into a discussion of the items which are to be administered, and perhaps we could save time by discussing the items themselves as we come to them. I will call items 296 and 295. Then if there

are any general questions, we can go back. If we take it that way, we shall I think cause the least difficulty to the minister and to the officials. If we take item 297, we can go back to items 296 and 295 afterwards.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I now give details of the construction projects for the historic sites section:

Completion of the Alexander Graham Bell Museum at Baddeck, Nova Scotia including equipment, $150,000.

Mr. HELLYER: Are you building one in Brantford too?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. May I put in the whole list and if any member feels that something is missing I shall be ready to discuss it afterwards.

Continuation of restoration and repairs to Halifax Citadel, $100,000. Continuation of excavation restoration and preservation work on the Fortress of Louisbourg, Nova Scotia, $5,000. The retracement and construction of road system within the boundaries of the Fortress of Louisbourg, $25,000. The construction of custodian's quarters in the Fort Anne National Historic Park, $17,000. Repairs to Fortification walls in Quebec City, $25,000. Restoration and repairs to Dufferin Terrace, Quebec, $42,500. Two-thirds of this expenditure will be recovered—one-third from the city of Quebec and one-third from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where is the general vote covering all these things in outline?

Hon. MEMBERS: Page 404.

Mr. HARKNESS: When I look at page 405 I do not see anything in there with regard to most of the things you have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes, you have further details on page 405—further details for the construction and acquisition of buildings, works, lands and new equipment—historic sites. This is a breakdown of the figure $459,364 which I am giving.

Mr. HARKNESS: This all relates to historic sites—none of them are parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, I am just trying to give orderly details.

The erection of new memorials throughout Canada $40,000. This applies to plaques and cairns.

Repairs to custodians' quarters, fencing and installation of new heating unit in the Fort Mountain National Historic Park, Ontario, $8,000. Renovation and repairs to Batoche Rectory, Saskatchewan, $5,000. Alterations to fur storage building for museum purposes at Lower Fort Garry, Manitoba $12,639. Construction of workshop and garage and landscaping administration building at Fort Battleford National Historic Park, Saskatchewan, $6,000. Covering walls at the Fort Edward blockhouse, Windsor, Nova Scotia, with split logs, $1,325. Completion of entrance road gate, landscaping, and re-location of power and telephone lines at the Port Royal National Historic Park, Nova Scotia, $4,500. The restoration of bomb-proof shelters at Fort Townshend, St. John's, Newfoundland, $4,000. Repairing and replacement of the palisades, repairing guardhouse, et cetera at Fort Wellington National Historic Park, Prescott, Ontario, $3,500, and a few other items below $2,500.

Now if there are any questions on national historic sites and monuments, we could deal with them at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the item which totals $194,273.

Hon. MEMBER: $459,364.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can give you an outline of the equipment if members of the committee require it—the equipment comes to only $3,250 of that total of $459,364.

Mr. THATCHER: I suppose this relates to straight federal expenditure.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, straight federal expenditure. I believe the provinces make expenditure on historic sites on their own account.

Mr. THATCHER: None of these are joint projects?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MICHENER: Fort Henry at Kingston is a provincial project, is it not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Did not the government take some part in this?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, we contributed to the restoration.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose that inevitably the division among the provinces is unequal because of the location of the sites. I have found that most of the expenditure is in Quebec and Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will understand, of course, that that part of Canada was settled first. We go on the recommendations of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board which is formed of representatives of each one of the provinces. Up to some years ago there was only one representative from all of the western provinces, but now there is one representative from each of the western provinces, so there has been in the last few years quite an increase in the work of that section of the department which appertains to the western provinces.

Mr. DINSDALE: I notice that there is a contribution towards Lower Fort Garry.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe Mr. Robertson could explain to you what we are going to do at Lower Fort Garry and what kind of agreement we are reaching with the Motor Country Club.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister*): Lower Fort Garry was turned over a few years ago by the Hudson's Bay Company to the government as a national historic site, and it is one of the national historic parks now. It has been under a lease to the Motor Country Club. It is used as a club by them, but the premises are open for members of the public to examine. As the lease is coming to an end in about another year, consideration has been given to the question of whether the lease should be terminated and the fort taken over entirely as a historic site, requiring the Motor Country Club to go elsewhere, or whether the common arrangement should be continued, and we have recently conducted discussion with the Motor Country Club on this question. An arrangement has been reached providing for a further five-year period of tenancy during which time they will be allowed to continue using the fort for their headquarters on the understanding that it will open to the public seven days a week. There will be a commissionaire, maintained by us, at the gate to ensure that public access is available. Access by the public will include access to all parts of the fort except the main building, which is the club house, and one subsidiary building which is the shower and locker room.

Mr. DINSDALE: The presence of a commissionaire is something new I believe.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is.

Mr. DINSDALE: I know that as a rule when you visit that spot you wander about yourself and it has not been possible to enter the buildings.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: My deputy and I visited Lower Fort Garry in June and we met the president and vice-president of the Motor Club. We examined the site and got an understanding. We thought that facilities for the public should be increased, hence this new arrangement.

Mr. THATCHER: Are these historic sites free to visit, or do you make a charge?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No charge is made.

Mr. HENRY: I will be interested in hearing a brief statement by the minister with regard to the arrangements whereby the Mackenzie House in Toronto which has a plaque in front of it, was declared to be a historic site. In addition to that I would like some general information as to the house at Woodside, North Kitchener which I believe to be one of the homes in which the late Prime Minister King spent his early days.

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON (*Superintendent, Historic Parks and Sites*): The Mackenzie House in Toronto is not administered by the National Parks branch. I cannot give you exactly the details of the organization which restored it. I believe admission is charged, though I cannot confirm that. Woodside, the boywood home of Mackenzie King in Kitchener was restored by the Mackenzie King Woodside Trust which is privately organized. Incidentally, the house was extremely well restored and furnished in period. When the restoration was practically complete, it was handed over to us, and it is now administered by the Parks branch. That was in 1954. There is still a fair amount of work to be done on the grounds, but the building itself has been substantially repaired inside and out, and a very good job has been done on it.

Mr. HENRY: Is it open all the year round or during the summer months only.

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: All the year round.

Mr. HENRY: Outside Mackenzie House in Toronto—I agree that it is operated by a private interest—there is a plaque which has been publicly unveiled. What procedure is there in your department for such a thing as that?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: Any recommendations for the placing of tablets or plaques are submitted to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board at their annual meeting in Ottawa. This is the body which advises the government on the placing of these plaques. It is a board which consists of recognized historians, and any proposals which are considered serious enough—and the majority of them are—go before them at their annual meeting. They pass on them and say whether the site is worthy of a monument or of a secondary tablet which commemorates personages with distinguished careers in Canadian history. The arrangements for erecting a monument or placing a plaque are carried out by the Parks branch. We have a plaque on the Mackenzie House in Toronto, but I am not certain in what year it was put up.

Mr. HENRY: How many of these plaques have been erected since the institution of this system throughout Canada?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: I think I can give you the figures on that. It has put up—plaques on monuments or plaques on buildings—about 500 since 1922.

Mr. HENRY: Are those figures broken down by provinces?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: Yes. It should be remembered of course, that Newfoundland came in only a comparatively short time ago. Five for Newfoundland, 156 for the maritime provinces, 231 for Quebec and Ontario, 69 for the prairie provinces and 41 for British Columbia. I might just perhaps elaborate on that by breaking these figures down further for the period 1922 to 1951, 1952 to 1954, to show that the proportion in the various areas has been changing within the last few years. I think I shall give the averages per year—

1922-1951: Maritime provinces 5; Quebec-Ontario 7; prairies 2; British Columbia 1.

1952-1954: Newfoundland 2; Maritime provinces 6; Quebec-Ontario 8; prairies 6; and British Columbia 3.

Mr. HENRY: With regard to marking these sites, do you go out to discover them, or do you wait until people or private bodies come to you?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: We have a large number of items before us each year. There are limitations upon the size of our staff, and the advisory board, it must be remembered, is an honorary body, so we do not look for sites ourselves at the moment. We have to handle the requests that come in. Usually the sites are investigated by the local board member—representation on the board is by province—and we have a representative in each province who does a great deal of work on investigation during the year in connection with the historic value of sites. In fact I would say that the board members probably put in more time during the year than they do in their work at the annual meeting here.

Mr. HENRY: Can you give us the names of the board members in each province?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: Oh yes. In Newfoundland, Mr. C. E. A. Jeffrey; in Nova Scotia, Dr. Thomas Raddall; in Prince Edward Island, The Hon. Thane Campbell; in New Brunswick, Professor A. G. Bailey; in Quebec, Mr. Justice E. Fabre-Surveyer; in Ontario, Professor Fred Landon, who is chairman of the Board; in Manitoba, the Reverend A. d'Eschambault; in Saskatchewan, Mr. Campbell Innes; in Alberta, Professor M. H. Long; and in British Columbia, Professor W. N. Sage. Have I covered all the provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe you have.

Mr. SIMMONS: Has any representation been made to set up a tablet or a plaque to mark the site of the official opening of the Alaska highway?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: That was recommended by the Board, I think, at the last meeting. Certainly the Alaska highway has been recommended for marking.

Mr. HENRY: Have you any further plans for the future expansion of the Woodside development in the Kitchener area?

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: None that have come to my attention. I cannot very well speak so far as policy matters and plans are concerned. I have been recently appointed to the section in any case.

Mr. GARLAND: I think Mr. Henry's questions have covered most of the matters which I was interested in. It does appear that both the federal government and the provincial governments are carrying on similar development of historic sites.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, Mr. Garland, as far as we are concerned, we are marking the sites which are of national importance. However, quite a lot of sites are of regional importance, and these we do not mark. These are the sites which are usually marked by the provincial governments.

Mr. GARLAND: I was wondering if you would comment further on that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The suggestions which are received are referred to the Board, and the Board, which is formed of historians, examines these suggestions and makes recommendations to us in cases which it considers to be of national importance.

Mr. HARKNESS: On what basis does it recommend whether these things are of national importance or not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The matter is left to the judgment of the historians who are members of the Board. These positions are completely honorary and—this will answer the questions of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Dinsdale in the House the other day—practically all the members of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board are members of the Canadian Historical Society, and four of them are past presidents.

Mr. HARKNESS: The reason I asked this was that an application was made four years ago to have Morley church declared a national historic site and I think the answer given was that it did not come within the general category

of things which would be considered as national sites. That is why I asked the question as to the general classification which is followed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are some general exclusions and one of the general exclusions is churches.

Mr. MICHENER: Unless they are in ruin.

Mr. MCLEOD: I would like to have the address of Professor Sage.

Mr. A. J. H. RICHARDSON: —the University of British Columbia. As a matter of fact I think he has retired. I may have his address here.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is Father d'Eschambault on the staff of the university?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: St. Boniface. He is from St. Boniface.

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes, but he is not on the staff there. He is a most well informed person on the history particularly of the western provinces because he has made a very thorough study of that subject.

Mr. MICHENER: I was going to inquire about the Board listed on page 45 of the report. What changes have been made since 1953, and by whom are the appointments made?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Appointments are made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MICHENER: What are the changes since 1953? I notice that Professor D. C. Harvey—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: He has resigned, and been replaced by Mr. Raddall, who, by the way, resigned about a month ago. I believe we are now studying the field to find a successor for the Nova Scotia vacancy. Mr. Justice Campbell from Prince Edward Island is still a member; Mr. Jeffery is a member, Mr. Bailey is still the member for New Brunswick, and Mr. Campbell Innes is the member for Saskatchewan; Dr. Alcock of course, is still the chief curator of the National Museum; Mr. Childe, the Secretary, has retired and he has been replaced by Mr. Richardson who has been answering questions asked by this committee.

Mr. MICHENER: I see that members of the Board meet once a year in Ottawa, and we have heard about—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The members of the Board do work of investigation all the year round.

Mr. MICHENER: There are some provinces which have established historic sites boards. I wonder whether there is any coordination of the work of the federal government and the work of the provinces in this field.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Robertson, I believe, can give you an example for Manitoba.

Mr. ROBERTSON: I mentioned earlier the case of the lower Fort Garry. In connection with that there was reference to the provincial historic board to get their views, and the agreement is partly based on the views they expressed. That is one case where there was cooperation. It frequently occurs along those lines.

Mr. MICHENER: Along the same general lines, in the report I see national historic parks. Is there a difference between the national park and the national historic park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. You have 17 national parks like Banff and Jasper which have been created for the enjoyment of the people of Canada. You will find at page 45 of the annual report the list of the national historic parks.

Mr. MICHENER: I see the list. One of them is Fort Louisbourg, one at Fort Anne in Nova Scotia. I suppose those are all built around some historic monument?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Are they administered separate from the national parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The same division but a different section.

Mr. MICHENER: What section?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The historic sites section of the National parks and historic sites division. If you want to make a comparison between the national parks on the one hand and the national historic parks on the other hand you can look at pages 34 and 35 of the annual report. You will see the list of the 17 national parks and a list of 10 of the national historic parks.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In connection with Manitoba we have been talking about lower Fort Garry. There is remaining in the city of Winnipeg a gate of upper Fort Garry. Does that come under the jurisdiction of your department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. It was marked by the historic sites section, but does not come under our jurisdiction. I am not sure if it is owned by the C.N.R. with the hotel or by the Hudson's Bay Company.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is very interesting. It is of much greater historical value than the lower fort. The lower fort has remained intact and has not been destroyed in any way, but the upper fort is of course the centre of Manitoba and the western territories and the Hudson's Bay Company's operations and has a much greater historical significance to Canada than lower fort.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Maybe the city owns it.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Is it the city, province or the Fort Garry Hotel of the C.N.R.? That is the type of thing I think should be under the jurisdiction of the dominion government because of its historic significance.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe it has been offered to us.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How does one go about this? What happens? Do you wait until things are offered you?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You might inquire.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Several years ago I was urging that upper fort be reconstructed. Had I been in this House then I would have raised it here. The vacant land was available but then the Imperial Oil Company saw fit to construct a building on the land which had been vacant for 50 years and the opportunity was lost. However, I think that gate of upper fort should be under the jurisdiction of your department.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I wonder if you would be satisfied if Mr. Richardson would inquire about the ownership of that gate, which, as you say, if of very great historical importance. I know where it is.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is such a well known site that I imagine the matter must have come up for discussion before.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We will inquire and I will advise you.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The matter has been discussed on various occasions I know, but I am rather surprised that it has not been brought to the attention of your department.

The CHAIRMAN: I would be surprised if it has not been discussed by the historic sites and monuments division.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does the historic sites board give any advice to the local societies across the country?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Most of the local historic societies as far as I know are privately organized. We do not attempt to organize any local historical societies. But, as far as cooperation goes that is a different question. I can say we would have to cooperate with them to quite an extent in arranging

for the erecting of monuments and research, and probably in connection with the unveiling ceremonies.

Mr. DINSDALE: Apparently there are not any channels of communication established as yet.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not think you could say any normal channels of communications, except that very often the board member for the particular province gets in touch with the local historical society in connection with a particular project. How often he gets in touch with them would be a result of what is required.

Mr. DINSDALE: There is a very rapidly growing interest.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, particularly since the war and even within the last year or two. I think the situation is such that a new policy will have to be handed down. It may not be possible to do it right away until things settle down a little bit.

Mr. DINSDALE: I notice in the long list of expenditures there is nothing earmarked for restoration of Indian sites.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is the rectory at Batoche which is the historic site of the battles of Riel.

Mr. DINSDALE: I am thinking of the area around Manitoba where you have Indian mounds which are quite well known to the local residents and apparently nothing has ever been done about them. Does the department take any interest in that?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Certainly that is under consideration at the present moment. There are one or two instances before us. There is the prehistoric earth works near St. Thomas in Ontario which have been written about many times, and the whole of that area is our property and is administered as an historic site. Various other ones have come up from time to time and some of the provinces have taken over the administration.

Mr. CHURCHILL: If I may revert to my other series of questions on upper Fort Garry, could the information in answer to my question be provided for our next meeting as to whether or not representations have been made by the board in respect to this?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I suppose Mr. Richardson will have to write for that information.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think I could check the files and see whether the matter has been discussed by the historic sites and monuments board.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is plaque on upper Fort Garry which has been put on by the historic sites division.

Mr. RICHARDSON: At the same time it is possible that further representations were made as to the actual taking over of the gate itself and possibly even its restoration, but I do not think that would be too hard to track down.

The CHAIRMAN: It would show in your minutes of proceedings.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think so.

Mr. CHURCHILL: If a person or group is interested in the acquisition of an historic site the procedure is to make a representation to the board?

Mr. RICHARDSON: To the board or to the minister.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To the minister and I submit it to the board for recommendation.

Mr. MICHENER: I did not see any appropriation for historic sites in British Columbia. Are there none there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the $40,000 for cairns and plaques there must be some for British Columbia.

Mr. HARKNESS: The minister said a little while ago there were general classes of sites such as churches which were for marking. Apparently that does not apply to rectories.

The CHAIRMAN: The reason for this action as to the rectory at Batoche is that it was the headquarters of Riel's government when it was set up in 1885. He took it over as the headquarters of his government. It has the bullet holes in it from the last engagement with Middleton's troops. I think it is a real historic site.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not because it was a rectory but because it was the headquarters of Riel.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in my part of the country about the confusion of doing anything about the Morley church.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are any of the sites connected with the career of Sir John A. Macdonald administered by the department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The burial place of Sir John A. Macdonald is in the cemetery of the village of Cataraqui, Ontario. Because of the national historic importance of this burial place the then Minister of Mines and Resources on the advice of the historic sites and monuments board of Canada entered into an agreement early in 1938 with the Cataraqui Cemetery Company whereby the company agreed to maintain the burial plot of Sir John A. Macdonald in perpetuity. Under the agreement which was authorized by P.C. 3092 of December 15, 1937, the sum of $1,500 was paid to the company to be set up as a trust fund under the Ontario Cemeteries Act to provide funds for the perpetual maintenance of the plot. In addition to caring for the burial place, the department has placed three tablets to the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald. In 1927 a cairn with tablets was erected near his boyhood home of Adolphustown, Ontario, and a tablet was placed on 110 to 112 Rideau Street, Kingston, where Sir John A. Macdonald lived for a number of years. In 1952 a tablet was affixed to the existing monument to Sir John A. Macdonald in City Park, Kingston.

Mr. DINSDALE: Are these tablets or markers designed to convey information to tourists or do they merely state briefly the name of the place? Is there any historical background?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a description of the historical significance. It is a short inscription on a bronze plaque.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the cost of these plaques and where and how are they made?

Mr. JACKSON: About 7 or 8 years ago the department called for a competition. These plaques are all copper and bronze. We called for a competition asking for designs and prices. A certain design was selected keeping in mind the price and from then on we have been buying these from the Empire Brass Company at Winnipeg, which is the firm who put in the lowest tender and the best design. The cost is around $400 to $600 each.

Mr. MICHENER: They have to be separately cast because of the lettering?

Mr. JACKSON: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: But there is a general design?

Mr. JACKSON: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Are the numerous plaques marking the war of 1812 in the Niagara area your department's or provincial?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think the Niagara Parks Commission has put up some, but we have put up some also, mentioning the names of the soldiers who fell in the Battle of Lundy's Lane.

Mr. MICHENER: I was thinking of those plaques which are about 2 feet by 18 inches.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The ones we have there are bigger than the other ones.

Mr. MICHENER: I know they are expensive. I had some experience in marking Champlain's route through Georgian Bay, part of the cost of that marking was financed by the provincial government and part locally, but $600 seems to be expensive for the sort of plaque used in the Niagara area.

Mr. JACKSON: They have the design on the outside edges, but there is blank in the middle and it depends on the number of letters you have in the centre.

Mr. MICHENER: Are you getting them at the same price?

Mr. JACKSON: I think when I first came in the department the price was around $400, but now with the increased cost of labour and metals it is around $600. I might say we are now having an investigation to see if we cannot get a better price. It is under study at the present time.

Mr. CHURCHILL: With respect to the marking of historic sites we see frequently on the highway indicating that there is an historic site ahead, are those sites the responsibility of the provincial government or does your department have anything to do with the placing of those signs on the highway?

Mr. JACKSON: I may say that we have taken the subject up with the various provinces. Some provinces are not keen on having those signs on the highway because people stop and accidents result. In some provinces they do mark them and sometimes there are places where the car can turn off the highway; we do try to get the signs there in cooperation with the provinces. But some provinces have said, no, that they do not want signs of that kind on main thoroughfares.

Mr. HELLYER: Have you ever contributed to the establishment of proper parking space or places to drive off the highway to make it feasible?

Mr. JACKSON: Not on provincial highways.

Mr. JUTRAS: When there are signs who pays for the sign?

Mr. JACKSON: We will pay for them if we are marking an historic site. Sometimes we would ask the provinces to put up a sign themselves.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In indicating a historic site my opinion is that the sign is much too close to the site and you are past the site before you notice what the sign said. In the United States some of the markers for that purpose are placed at a very considerable distance from the historic site and you have plenty of time to slow down and turn in.

Mr. MICHENER: In some cases you would have to have them a couple of miles away in order to slow down.

Mr. RICHARDSON: And to watch you are not causing an accident.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the minister proceed with his information.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I, gentlemen, refer you to page 405 of the blue book. The next item is "National Parks Trunk Highways", $2,257,225 which is an increase of a little over $800,000 over last year. May I give you a detail of this amount of $2,257,225. To complete the construction on mile 0 to 10,

Banff-Jasper highway, which is at the Lake Louise end, $200,000. Continuation of reconstruction of the Banff-Jasper highway, 12 miles from mile 11 to mile 22, $811,200.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is in Jasper?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, in Banff, at the Banff end of the highway. Asphalt paving on the initial 10 miles of reconstructed Banff-Jasper highway, from Lake Louise, $250,000. Continuation of the paving of the Cabot Trail, approximately 50 miles, in Nova Scotia, $300,000. Widening of certain sections of the Cabot Trail between Mackenzie mountain and Corney Brook, $23,540. Construction of steel flex-beam guard-rail on hazardous curves, bridge approaches and fills from park headquarters to Neil's Harbour on the Cabot Trail, $23,430. Replacement of Astoria river bridge on the Banff-Jasper highway in the Jasper section, $150,000. Replacement of the Beauty Creek bridge on the Banff-Jasper highway, $58,000. Seal coating of asphalt bound base, mile 48·3 to mile 56 on the Banff-Jasper highway, Jasper section, $5,500. Laying of 15 miles of asphalt bound base between mile 0 and mile 36 on the Banff-Windermere highway, $195,000. Installation of 2,100 feet of flex-beam guard rail between Sinclair Canyon and Radium Hot Springs acquacourt on the Banff-Windermere highway, $4,385. Installation of pipe arches across the Banff-Windermere highway of Kootenay crossing, $4,170. Erection of Armco flex-beam guard rail on hill and curve on No. 10 highway around the southern end of the golf course in Riding Mountain National Park, $2,000. Replacement of Waterton River Bridge, $230,000. This makes the total which I have mentioned of $2,257,225.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that the minister told us yesterday or the day before that the responsibility for trunk highways had now passed from his department to that of the Department of Public Works and as a result the engineering branch had been reduced considerably.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but not the financial responsibility. The moneys for it are under the estimates of the department, but the designing and the works are done under direction of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. HARKNESS: The major items which you mention here, particularly for the Banff-Jasper highway, while that money is voted here, it is turned over to the Department of Public Works as far as the construction of the work is concerned?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. It is really a parks expenditure, but in order to avoid duplication and because in the Department of Public Works they have gained a vast amount of experience in building the Trans-Canada highway, it is wiser to have the work under the supervision of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. HARKNESS: When it comes to the question of the maintenance of these roads who carries on the maintenance?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do. The parks branch is doing the maintenance work.

Mr. HARKNESS: All the maintenance on these roads is done by the parks branch?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: The only thing which the Department of Public Works do is new construction?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: The Department of Public Works I presume does that by the letting of contracts?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: There were no public works, personnel and equipment for construction purposes. They are simply for supervisory purposes?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And designing.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as this Banff-Jasper highway is concerned, you are planning to complete the asphalting and so forth of 10 miles this year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, at the south end.

Mr. HARKNESS: And you are laying the base, or doing the construction on a further 12 miles of highway which will be next to this portion upon which $811,000 is to be spent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as the remainder of this highway is concerned, what are your maintenance plans for this year?

Mr. J. A. HUTCHISON: The maintenance plan is similar to that of last year.

Mr. HARKNESS: What I am getting at particularly is this: I did not travel over the Banff-Jasper highway last year, but I was there the year before, and when I went up that highway it was in very bad shape, full of potholes and so forth, and I was kept very busy listening to complaints by American tourists about the terrible state the road was in. I suggested, when the estimates were being discussed last year, that a good many of the tourists' complaints in connection with this road with regard to both dust and the potholes could be obviated by increasing the amount of maintenance work done, particularly by grading and the use of more graders. That struck me very forcibly because when I drove back from Jasper the road had been freshly graded and it was in much better shape than when I had made the trip up. It occurred to me forcibly that a great many of the complaints with regard to that road could be avoided by a comparatively small increase in the number of graders and the amount of maintenance being carried out. I was wondering how much had been done last year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can tell you, Mr. Harkness, that after you raised the question in the House, I gave specific instructions that more attention should be given to the maintenance of that part of the Banff-Jasper highway which was gravelled, and as a matter of fact, when I travelled over that road last year, it was in very good shape. That was at the beginning of July.

Mr. HARKNESS: What increase has there been in the number of graders or in the amount of—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not so much the increase in the number of graders as in the number of trips they make.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what I was about to say. How frequently do the graders run over the gravelled portions?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: When I issue instructions they are also issued by Mr. Hutchison to the Park Superintendent, and he is told to pay more attention to this work and have the grader pass more often over that portion of the road. It is not a matter of knowing if he is going to pass over once or twice a week. It depends on the weather. We have to leave such matters, to a certain extent, to the Superintendent and the foreman's judgment. After we have given instructions that the road should be kept in good order, we leave it to them to decide when and how often the grader should pass. They know we are going to check the work to see whether it is well done, and according to my own experience last year—

Mr. HARKNESS: Naturally, Mr. Lesage, they would do a good job when they knew you were going to pass over the road.

Mr. SIMMONS: I agree with Mr. Harkness. I went over that road on June 20 last year, and there were more potholes—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Probably you will remember, Mr. Simmons that on all the roads in the parks in the western provinces we had difficulties last year in the month of June, and so did all the provincial governments. I am not blaming any government, but I can tell you that at the end of June the roads in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta—the provincial roads—were in a deplorable state because of the weather conditions. It was not only the park roads which were affected; the provincial roads were worse.

Mr. SIMMONS: I did not even see a grader working there the whole distance I travelled through that park.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Maybe it was the lunch hour. I do not believe this is fair to the parks employees.

Mr. SIMMONS: Of course, I was a little early in the season at that time on June 20th. It was a late season.

Mr. HELLYER: How soon do you hope to have the whole road paved?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That will depend on the amount of money parliament will vote each year for that purpose.

Mr. HELLYER: Do you think the falling off in the number of visitors to Glacier park last year is connected with the bad state of the highway?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are no roads into Glacier park. You cannot go by road. You can only go by train.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many more graders are you putting on that road if any?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We cannot answer that question.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is the sort of thing we should perhaps be paying more attention to, and be able to answer. There is no question whatever in my mind that the condition of that road for the past two or three years has made for extremely bad relations as far as tourists coming here from the United States are concerned. I am convinced that the condition of that road, due to improper or insufficient maintenance, has lost us millions of dollars from tourists who otherwise would have visited this area, but they have heard such bad reports from their friends that they have stayed away.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a worn-out road, as you know, but I will renew my instructions that more attention should be given to it this year.

Mr. HARKNESS: It may be a worn-out road, but my personal experience is that if the grader were passed over it more often it would not be a bad one to travel on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will look into the matter.

Mr. YUILL: Last year was an exceptionally bad year. Jasper is in my constituency, and I appreciate very much what the minister is doing there. I do not think that there is any road anywhere last year which was really good and which could be maintained up to standard by those working on it. There is a lot of new grade being built there, and a certain amount of "rough passage" over new grade must be expected, but I should like to compliment those concerned on the speed with which they are going ahead on that job. I am happy to know that part of that road is going to be extended, though I am disappointed to learn that the bulk of the spending is to be on the Banff end.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We started on the Jasper end and most of it is done there.

Mr. YUILL: I appreciate that you have got to do your work when you can. I cannot feel that there is a lack of sufficient maintenance. I believe a

lot of the trouble is because of the adverse weather conditions and I would like to compliment those concerned, on the good job they are doing under terrible circumstances.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS: They charged me a dollar for the privilege of taking my dog through the park, without even getting out of the car.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Did you keep your dog in the car all the time?

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, I was just going through. I had a legitimate complaint. But I do not think it is quite as bad as Mr. Harkness made out. It was a boulevard compared with some of the roads I went over in Alberta.

Mr. HARKNESS: One of the reasons I was wondering about this question of maintenance was because I have been looking at the details on page 403—the number of tractor operators and so on. I see that the number is down rather than up, and it seems to me that the amount of maintenance you are going to do during this coming year will be less than that you did last year which, I think, would be a great pity.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you look at page 403 you will see that there is a decrease in the number of seasonal employees.

Mr. HARKNESS: These would all be seasonal.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, there is a decrease in the number of large tractor operators, but there is an increase of three full-time operators. So, in man-hours, there is quite an increase. There is, I am told, an over-all increase.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes, but the operators in this particular park would, I think, all be seasonal.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you will take a look at page 403 you will find that there is an increase there. There is an over-all increase of two in the number of seasonal operators. As to the large tractor operators, there is an increase of three, and for small tractor operators, full-time, an increase of two.

Mr. CHURCHILL: A question with regard to policy. I am looking at tables on page 34 of the annual report, and at pages 404 and 405 of the estimates, and attempting to relate the attendance of visitors at the parks with the amount of money spent on them, and I was wondering what the policy of the department is. For example, when it comes to visitors to national parks, Banff is first, Riding Mountain is second, Point Pelee is third, Kootenay is fourth. When you come to expenditure on operation and maintenance, you find that Banff is first, Jasper second, Prince Albert third, Riding Mountain fourth. And when you come to construction or acquisition of buildings, the order is: Banff first, Jasper second, Kootenay third, Prince Albert fourth, Riding Mountain fifth. And then I notice that taking the over-all expenditure on operation and maintenance plus construction and acquisition of buildings, we are estimating an expenditure of something over $9 million, of which one-thtird would be expended in the Banff area. Now what is the policy of the department in relation to the expenditure of money on these parks and the number of visitors?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The figures of attendance are very misleading. People come in, for instance, to Point Pelee Park in very great numbers; they will go for one afternoon to have a swim and then will come back and get out of the park. When you consider the attendance in Riding Mountain, for instance, you will have a very great number of entries in the park which will really be through traffic on No. 10 highway going up to Dauphin. While in Jasper, in Banff Park, Waterton Park, and Prince Albert Park, people will go in the park and stay a few days. Last summer, during the visit I made with my deputy minister to the parks, we have given instructions to try to get some idea of the number of tourist days that are spent in the various parks in order to have a much better picture of the number of days of attendance by tourists in the

parks or visitors in the parks. It is clear for instance, that a man going from the south entrance of Riding Mountain Park to Dauphin is not a tourist, he is using the road because it is better than the provincial road. But we are now analysing these figures and hope that this coming summer we will make a countercheck of the one which has been made last year and then we might have a true picture of the visitor attendance at the parks.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Would you at the same time keep a record of the American tourists who enter these parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I recognize the fact that these figures are misleading because I know at some of the parks you enter and drive out and go back the same day.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In your province you know that a great number of the entries at the south gate of Riding Mountain are just through traffic to Dauphin.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I recognize that but although the figures are misleading is this expenditure of money related to the benefit of the people? The parks are established for the benefit of the people generally, and that is a question which enters my mind when you are spending so much on Banff which may require it and very little on some of these other parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Which ones do you have in mind?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have given you a list. You can see how they run. It runs right up to 12. For example, on page 404, where you are dealing with operating and maintenance I point out that Banff is first, Jasper second, Prince Albert third, Riding Mountain fourth and then you come to Kootenay Park which is fifth, and Cape Breton Highlands Park sixth, then Yoho Park seventh. Then on page 34 of the annual report you will see the number of visitors. I think there is not a good relationship between the amount of money expended and the number of people who enter these parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I might say, Mr. Churchill, that the most important criteria as far as maintenance expenditures are concerned is the area of the park. About 80 per cent of the expenditures can be really related on the area. Take for instance Banff and Jasper which are very large parks where we have to have a large warden service and fire protection organization. And the mileage of roads that we have to maintain in these large parks is much greater than in the small parks.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I realize that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is about 80 per cent of the expenditure. The important criterion is the area of the park.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You would also have to consider the location of population to accessibility, would you not? The parks are for the enjoyment of the Canadian people and you have to see that the roads are in reasonable condition so that people can get in and out and that the facilities are there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the parks?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes, and that the facilities are there for people who visit the parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. CHURCHILL: As you say it is a question of policy and that you are justified in spending a third of your vote on Banff, that is over $3 million. Take operation, maintenance and this other of construction and acquisition plus the figures you gave for road building, and it runs to over $3 million.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Most of the figure of road building which I gave is in the interest of Jasper Park as much as Banff Park. As a matter of fact, as my

deputy points out, it is more in the interest of Jasper than in the interest of Banff and there are more people going to Banff than to Jasper.

Mr. YUILL: It gives you a two-way entrance.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. MCLEOD: There is another thing Mr. Churchill is overlooking and that is the terrain. Certainly it costs a lot more to build a mile of road in Banff and Jasper than in the parts he is referring to.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am not overlooking any of those factors. What I am asking is in what way is the policy determined with respect to the expenditure of this money, and I would point out that the greater part of it is going to the Banff and Jasper areas.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you look at page 38 of the departmental report. That will give you an idea of the mileage of the roads, trails and telephone lines which we have to maintain for each park. You will see, for instance, that while we have 1009 miles of roads and trails in Banff park we have only 38 miles in Elk island, 81 miles in Fundy and in the one park in which you are more interested only 227 miles which is about one-fifth of the mileage of roads and trails in Banff park.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I recognize that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This has something to do with the cost of maintenance; it has a lot to do with it. As I said the area of the park accounts for about 80 per cent of the expenditures.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, I am not presenting any argument in favour of taking the money away from Banff and Jasper and spending it on Riding mountain. You have the whole series of national parks right across the country. I do not know the conditions by any means, but perhaps if conditions were different in some of these other national parks you might have a larger attendance. What I am noting is you are putting your emphasis on the Banff-Jasper area. Is it the opinion of the minister that that is where the proper emphasis should be laid?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are the largest parks. Do you believe we are pouring money into Banff and Jasper for maintenance for the fun of it? We are maintaining the parks to equal standards and the cost from park to park varies according to the area of the park.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, the question perhaps cannot be determined. I simply raised it in an endeavour to discover what is the over-riding policy in regard to national parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The over-riding policy is to maintain equal status all due account being given to the nature of the park. For instance Elk Island Park is primarily an animal preserve linked with a picnic ground. Banff and Jasper are parks where tourists spend a number of days when they go there. The Prince Albert park at Waskesiu Lake is a place where people from Saskatchewan own bungalows and spend the summer, or part of the summer, around the lake. So, you have various features in each park which determine the amount of maintenance costs and the nature of the maintenance. But on the whole the main factor in the cost of the maintenance is the area of the park. I do not think I can add anything to that.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was just trying to find out what the policy was.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the policy.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is the point I raised in the House on another occasion in regard to Riding Mountain National Park, on a question of amenities for people who visit that park, and I have asked you on other occasions, when many people go there not only by car but by bus, why there is not a shelter for

people who travel by bus. That is the type of amenity which I think should be established in a park which is visited by so many people.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Last year the example you gave as to those amenities, if my memory serves me right, is that you wanted to have some kind of a bus depot. May I answer you on this that I took up your suggestion and I wrote to the Greyhound Bus Company and I wrote to the Manitoba Transit Company who operate buses to Riding Mountain Park. I did not even have the favour of an answer from the Manitoba Transit Company. As to the Greyhound Company I will read the answer:

> Dear Sir:
>
> Further to my letter of August 2, 1954, I wish to advise you that upon further consideration of the matter it was decided that our company would not be interested in constructing a bus terminal at Riding Mountain National Park.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> Western Canadian Greyhound Lines, Ltd.

That letter was dated September 30, 1954. At Banff Park you have a wonderful bus depot built by the Greyhound people, but here is the answer I get from the same company with respect to Riding Mountain. The transportation companies provide these depots; it is not done by our department. Because you had brought up the matter in the House I wrote to the two companies and I have just told you how I was favoured by them in their answer.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Perhaps I did not use the right word when I said "bus depot". When you speak of a bus depot people think it is a very expensive building with all sorts of things in it. I was not thinking of that at all. I was thinking of a wooden hut which would be in the nature of a shelter. Perhaps I should have used that expression.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Perhaps you could write to them and you may be more successful than I was.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was successful in getting them to run a through service through the park. Whose concern is it, is it the concern of the people who carry people into the park or the concern of the park authorities to provide shelter and accommodation?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not the responsibility of the national parks administration to supply the means of transportation to the park. It is the responsiblity of the parks administration to make the parks attractive so that people will come and enjoy the parks. Now, the policy has been in the past and still is that transportation facilities should be provided by those who are paid for the transportation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am not talking about transportation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What is a bus company if it is not a transportation company?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am talking about a terminal.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Do you mean that a railway station is not part of a transportation system?

Mr. CHURCHILL: You provide for people who come in by car, they have a place where they can park their caravans, they have wash rooms and so on. But there is no provision made for the people who come by bus.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The same provision is made for those who come by bus.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Miles away. Try walking it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but we are not going to operate buses in the parks.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Let us not introduce a "red herring". I am not asking you to provide buses. I am asking for shelter to be provided.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe your "shelter" is a "red herring".

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am asking for shelter for those people who come by bus and leave by bus.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe the only means of doing this is to try and convince the transportation companies. I have done my best but I was not very successful.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, I raise the matter again, here, and I will raise it again in the future.

Mr. YUILL: I think that perhaps more emphasis should be placed on accommodation in parks such as Jasper. I have been there when I could not find a cottage at any price. I understand that there are some privately operated cabins, but even including them, visitors face a problem in trying to get accommodation over night. In the case of some of the smaller parks, I think they are just there for convenience, and for amusement more than anything else. They are convenient for bathing parties, and to entertain people and so on on a Sunday, but when visitors go to Jasper, particularly, they go there to spend a few days, and it is annoying for them to find that they cannot get a place in which to stay and that they must sleep in the car or under a tree. I do not know whether it would be practicable or possible to build more cottages or to enlarge the number of privately operated units, but I find that shortage of accommodation is one of the complaints which I get in my part of the country. That applies, of course, only to the peak season.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe, Mr. Yuill, that we should be in the hotel business. Our system is a system of giving concessions, as you know, and we are always ready to consider sympathetically any request which we receive from private enterprise for the erection of additional housing facilities or for additional hotel or motel facilities.

Mr. YUILL: I have been told by those who are operating some of these cottages that the terms which the government is charging for that privilege are a little difficult with regard to the amount of money which is required for the concession. Has the minister considered that angle?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do not get a lot of money from the concessions. They are on a percentage basis, and it is three per cent. If they have a lot of clients, we receive more mony; if they have fewer clients, then we get less. Really we are sharing the risk with them, and we think this is a much better way of doing it than to charge a flat rate.

Mr. YUILL: I am very glad to hear that. I was under the impression that you definitely charged these concessionaires whether they were doing business or not, and that in some cases it was a rather stiff fee.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is however, a policy which we have been expanding over the last few years and there are still some people, mainly in the townsites who pay a flat rate of rental under the old system.

The CHAIRMAN: On account of the veterans affairs committee concluding its work last night, sooner than was anticipated, this room will be free this afternoon and the minister is also free then and would like to proceed with the consideration of his estimates. But the meeting has not been called, and my thought in the matter was that I would say that we would hold it unless a substantial part of the committee was against holding it. I would not want to call the meeting against the wishes of even a substantial part of the committee.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Might I say a word and ask for the co-operation of the members in sitting this afternoon. Right now we are in the midst of discussion on the parks and Monday morning we will start, it has been agreed, on northern administration. I am convinced, or I hope, that if we go on with the parks this afternoon, after the general discussion we have had this morning, we can go to the details of administration and capital expenditures on the parks and we might finish this afternoon. It would be of great help, I believe.

Mr. HARKNESS: I can see that we may make more progress that way, but it happens, with the supplementary estimates being under discussion in the House this afternoon most of us in this party should be or wish to be in the House. Therefore, I do not think it is a reasonable or fair thing to hold this meeting under the circumstances.

Mr. SIMMONS: Is there any objection to holding it this evening?

The CHAIRMAN: Friday night is a night when no one thinks we should have a meeting.

Mr. HARKNESS: Unless the supplementary estimates are finished this afternoon they will be on this evening also.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harkness, does that apply to your whole party? Could you not staff the committee.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not think we can under the circumstances.

Mr. CHURCHILL: We would like to help the minister along, but I do not think we can.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you wish, I had hoped we would finish our estimates before the Easter recess.

Mr. HARKNESS: It just happens that this is a particularly bad day.

The CHAIRMAN: What I have in mind is that we meet Monday at 10.30 and 8.00 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As I told you, Mr. Chairman, I shall have four bills which will be called on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: On Monday our meeting will be 10.30, Tuesday 10.30 and then there is the question of the night meeting.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can tell you better this evening when I know what the program is for Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have this understanding in regard to Monday, 10.30 for sure and if the minister can be here at 8.00 o'clock you will have notice of that at the 10.30 meeting. Tuesday at 10.30, Wednesday at 3.30, Thursday at 8.00 o'clock and Friday at 10.30 and 3.30. This of course will be subject to you, Mr. Minister, being able to be here.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Is this only one meeting a day?

The CHAIRMAN: Monday 10.30 only: You cannot be here in the afternoon or evening. I said 8.00 o'clock is a possibility, Tuesday at 10.30 and 8.00 o'clock is a possibility if you can be here. Wednesday 3.30, because that is the only suitable time. Thursday 8.00 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We might be able to meet in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Then I will put 3.30 down as a possibility, and at 8.00 o'clock at night. We have to reserve the rooms ahead of time otherwise we would not be able to meet at all.

Mr. HARKNESS: We should not determine this entirely on the basis of whether the minister can be here.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Up until now I have not prevented any meeting of the committee. On the contrary, I have pushed ahead with as many meetings as possible. Do not come to the House and say there that I am responsible for a delay in this committee.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am bringing up the point that some attention has to be given to other members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I have tried to do that. We will adjourn until 10.30 on Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 18

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Officer; Mr. F. J. G. Cunningham, Director, Northern Administration and Lands Branch; Mr. G. Montsion, Head, Estimates Section; Mr. F. Fraser, Chief Territorial Division; Mr. J. V. Jacobson, Head, Educational and Vocational Training Section, and Mr. J. A. Cantley, Head, Administrative Section, Arctic Division.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

55902—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Benidickson	Habel	McBain
Bryson	Hardie	McLeod
Cannon	Harkness	Michener
Churchill	Hellyer	Power (*St. John's West*)
Deschatelets	Henry	Robichaud
Dinsdale	Jutras	Simmons
Dupuis	Lesage	Thatcher
Garland	MacEachen	Yuill—26.
	Macnaughton	

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

NOTE—The name of Mr. Monteith was substituted for that of Mr. McBain after the morning meeting.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

FRIDAY, March 25, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Habel be substituted for that of Mr. Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*) on the said Committee.

MONDAY, March 28, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Monteith be substituted for that of Mr. McBain on the said Committee.

Attest.

LÉON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

55902—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, March 28, 1955.
(22)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Garland, Habel, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, McBain, McLeod, Power (*St. John's West*), Robichaud, Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; F. J. G. Cunningham, Director, Northern Administration and Lands Branch; Mr. G. Montsion, Head, Estimates Section; Mr. F. Fraser, Chief, and Mr. J. V. Jacobson, Head, Educational and Vocational Training Section, Territorial Division; and Mr. J. A. Cantley, Head, Administrative Section, Arctic Division.

The Committee considered the 1955-56 Estimates of the Northern Administration and Parks Branch.

Mr. Lesage made a statement on government policy concerning Northern Administration, outlining plans for the future and some of the difficulties that arise.

The Minister and his officials supplied additional information and were questioned thereon.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING—(23)

The Special Committee on Estimates resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Garland, Habel, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Jutras, Lesage, McLeod, Simmons, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: Same as at morning sitting.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Northern Administration and Lands Branch, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 312, 315 and 316 were adopted.

At 5.35 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Tuesday, March 29.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, March 28, 1955.
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

This morning we are on item 312 "Branch Administration, Northern Administration and Lands Branch". The minister has a very important statement to make to the committee.

Hon. JEAN LESAGE (*Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Last week when dealing with the first vote on the estimates of the department we had a preliminary discussion about the policy of the government for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. I said that the policy of the government as stated by the Prime Minister at the last session of parliament was to give more attention to our north and to further its economic and political development.

Since last session, I have, with my officials, given first priority in our studies and actions to our north country. We first had to assess the situation. In order to gather first hand knowledge and information of the conditions, my deputy minister, one of my assistant deputies, and I, made an extended trip last July and August through the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

As I intimated the other day, we formed the firm conviction that there were two fundamental problems in the Canadian north, problems that we have been actively considering since: first, the achievement of its economic development as an integral part of Canada; second, the adjustment of its native people to a new way of life. As I said last Wednesday we have to deal with two main problems; one is economic, the other is human.

In the economic field our policy is to develop the natural resources of the north for the maximum national advantage. The process will involve gainfully occupying more and more natives and attracting people to the north.

The natural resources of the north are, as I said, first and foremost the minerals; we also have water resources, principally in the Yukon, and there is a certain amount of arable land; we have commercial fisheries, mostly on Great Slave lake; there are oil and gas possibilities for development; and there is in the southern parts of both territories, especially the MacKenzie and the southern part of the Yukon a certain amount of commercial timber. In order to develop these resources we intend to create a favourable economic climate that will attract private enterprise to invest the necessary capital on a sound economic basis. The first thing we have to do is bring about a reduction in the high costs that prevail in the north. The cost of getting in machinery and supplies is high. The cost of getting production to the markets is high. The wage levels are high and the cost of living is also high. What are the causes? There are basically two reasons; the first one is the remoteness of the country, which is by far the most important, and the second one is the length and severity of the winters. These two factors combine to form a third factor which is the present unattractiveness to many people. It takes higher wages to attract them. Of course, remoteness brings costly transportation. The high cost of transportation appears everywhere. It is a direct cost to mines. It appears in the price level and in the wage levels. We are now actively discussing ways and means of bringing these costs down.

As to water transportation we have had since January preliminary talks with the officers of the Northern Transportation Company, and we will have a further meeting with them next week. We are hopeful of obtaining a fair reduction in rates to and in the north. As to air transportation, The Canadian Pacific Airlines has now before the Air Transport Board an application for a reduction in their rates to and in the north. We are hopeful that a favourable decision will be rendered in the immediate future. We have decided to have a more vigorous policy of road construction. We have already made provision for more road building and we are studying a possible revision of the road policy in the north which up until now has been along the lines recommended by the interdepartmental committee on territorial financial problems in its report of 1951 and accepted by the government, which is as follows:

> The committee recommends that in future all roads in the Territories be classified as "local", "resource" or "trunk". "Local" roads would lie within the bounds of a local administrative district or settlement. These should be entirely a territorial responsibility, which would ordinarily be delegated to, or shared with, local administrative districts in whatever manner the territorial government chose to adopt.
>
> "Resource" roads would be those deemed essential to the effective exploitation of some natural resource. The capital and maintenance costs of such roads should be borne by the federal government, or divided between the federal government and any interested private company.
>
> "Trunk" roads would be those connecting various settlements (including portage roads where the trunk artery is a waterway). Construction of these should be financed by the federal government, with maintenance assumed by the territorial or the federal government, whichever has been the primary advocate of the construction of the particular road.

We intend to discuss as soon as possible with the Department of Finance the possible revision which we are now studying, which would give greater encouragement to road construction. I have already said, last Wednesday, that our ultimate objective is to have a railway to Great Slave lake, and we are studying the problem with railway authorities in the light of possible developments, especially at Pine Point.

Other possible lines of assistance to create a favourable economic climate are being given preliminary consideration, some with other departments of government. One possibility, for instance, to which thought has been given is that of extending the three-year period of exemption from the corporate income tax. Another is the lowering of power costs by extending the period of capital amortization of power plants of the Northwest Territories Power Commission.

All these possibilities have to be seriously studied in the light of our wish for a sound economic development, and we are vigorously pushing these studies ahead.

The second problem is the human problem. This is the problem of the natives of the Northwest Territories. The Indians living around the Great Slave lake and along the Mackenzie valley including the Liard valley, have already been touched by our civilization. The Eskimos of the eastern Arctic will be brought into closer contact with our civilization in the years to come. In their present in-between stage the Indians have received few, very few, of the benefits of our civilization. For their furs they have got some of our food and some of our tools and clothing, but this is not enough to give in terms of the civilization which we, through our contacts and ideas, are taking from them. The nation as a whole gives them family allowances, old age

pensions, and relief when indigent, but the broader needs—and they are immediate needs—are health, education and a sound economy. The health needs are looked after by the Department of National Health and Welfare, and there have been great improvements in the last few years. As a matter of fact, because of that, the population of both Indians and Eskimos has already increased, and will in future increase to a greater extent, as there is a continued increase in the health facilities provided for the north.

In the economic field our program is to diversify the activities of the natives. We appointed on the first of January a director of vocational training for the north. As I said last Wednesday, we intend to train them for farming where possible. We are training some of them in carpentry, motor mechanics, boat building, handicrafts, Eskimo art, eiderdown collecting, reindeer herding, et cetera. In addition, Eskimos are presently employed on certain defence establishments, and even on the construction of the DEW line, and we intend to prepare as many as possible for regular employment at defence installations and weather stations. But the most important thing is to provide them with at least some basic education.

According to the latest figures there are 1,097 Indian children of school age in the Northwest Territories. Of these only 425 are attending school, and of that number only about 300—less than 30 per cent—attend regularly. There are 2,116 Eskimo children of school age. Of these only 327, or 15 per cent, are attending schools. (Another 400 receive a certain amount of part-time instruction from missionaries in some Arctic areas.)

Until recently the lack of education for most of the Indians and Eskimos in the Northwest Territories was not too serious. Nearly all of them were able to earn their livelihood by hunting, fishing and trapping; and there was no good reason to think they could not continue to do so. Furthermore, there did not appear to be much prospect that other ways of life, for which education would equip them, would be available for more than a very few.

During the past few years, however, conditions have been changing. The rate of change has accelerated recently and the situation has now reached a serious state. Several factors have been at work. The Indian and Eskimo population has been rising for a number of years and in the past eight or ten years the rate of population growth has gone up substantially. This is the natural result of increased medical services and the better food and clothing made available for children by family allowances. It seems clear that for many years to come the rate of population growth among the Indians and Eskimos will be substantially higher than the national average.

The increase in population places a greater demand on the supply of game and fur bearing animals and it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Indians and Eskimos to gain a living in their accustomed way. The effects of the growing population have, moreover, been intensified in recent years by a sharp fall in fur prices and by a simultaneous fall in the volume of the catch. Muskrats, for instance, in the Northwest Territories averaged $2.01 per skin in 1950-51 and only 67 cents per skin in 1953-54. The total value of the catch declined from $1,400,000 in 1950-51 to $401,000 in 1953-54—a decline of nearly 75 per cent. No other segment of the Canadian population has suffered such a disastrous drop in income since the 1930's.

Because of these developments there has been a rapid rise in relief payments to Eskimos and Indians during the past few years.

Apart from continuing financial cost of relief to the federal government (now approaching $200,000 per year) the relief payments have a demoralizing effect on the Eskimo and Indian populations. If reliance on relief is prolonged and extensive, it will become increasingly difficult to make the people self-supporting.

These changing conditions have for some time been making it progressively harder for the native population to rely on their traditional ways of life. Other sources of income are becoming available to the Eskimos and Indians, but they will be available only provided they are equipped to take advantage of them.

Economic development and increased defence activities is already bringing, and will continue to bring, opportunities for employment. At the same time, plans are proceeding for the stimulation of small industries, such as boat building, etc., which I mentioned a few moments ago. The natives will not, however, be able to take advantage of these and other opportunities unless they have some schooling. Primary schooling is the minimum requirement and vocational training is needed by many. Given the necessary education and training there is no reason why Eskimos and Indians cannot satisfactorily fill may of the jobs in northern Canada which would otherwise have to be undertaken by people brought in from the south, often at high cost.

The very thin and scattered population in the north, as well as the nomadic or semi-nomadic character of the native population, makes the provision of education extremely difficult. Until 1946 the only education available was provided by mission schools—some day schools, some residential schools. Since 1946 a few day schools have been established for Indians by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and a few for Eskimos by the Department of Northern Affairs. It has become apparent, however, that these day schools alone are not an adequate solution. The Indians of the Mackenzie valley have to travel as much as two hundred miles to reach their trap lines. If their children are attending day schools, they have to be taken out in order to accompany their families, and they are usually absent for a month at a time. In the case of the Eskimos, their settlements are normally so small (usually three or four families) that local school facilities cannot be made available except in a very few places. Residential facilities have to be provided or education is quite impossible for most of the Eskimo and Indian children.

Until now some residential facilities have been available in the Mackenzie valley in mission residental schools; one run by the Anglican church at Aklavik, and three by the Roman Catholic church at Aklavik, Fort Providence and Fort Resolution. The two schools at Aklavik will have to be abandoned when the town is moved in the next two years or so. The schools at Fort Providence and Fort Resolution are both extremely old and also have to be abandoned shortly because they are in a state of collapse. The churches are not in a financial position to replace these worn-out facilities and are not remotely able, even with substantial assistance, to expand the residential facilities to cope with the present or future needs.

A careful examination of the whole situation has been carried out, and it is clear that it is necessary to begin immediately in the Northwest Territories a program of construction of hostels and of associated day school facilities. The government approved the program early last week.

Hostels operated in conjunction with day schools will have substantial advantages in the north. The Indian, half-breed, and white population of the Mackenzie valley is very much intermingled, and it is uneconomic to provide Indian educational facilities separate from those for the others. A hostel, with a school for all to attend (whether residential or local pupils) will be less costly.

A special curriculum, involving a substantial amount of manual and basic vocational training, is being worked out for children who are not likely to go beyond grade school. This will require special equipment and teachers. The centralization of such teaching in government day schools will be more efficient and economic. The mingling of pupils—whether Indian, Eskimo, half-blood or white—in common schools will have important scoial and psychological advantages in the north.

The provision of more adequate primary education is most urgent in the Mackenzie valley. The educational needs of the Eskimos, other than those in the area around the mouth of the Mackenzie, will have to be met in a greater degree in the near future, but they can be deferred in part for the moment. Accordingly, all the hostels to be constructed within the next five years, except one, will be in the Mackenzie valley. The exception is a hostel at Frobisher Bay, on Baffin Island, to provide one centre for vocational training and education for Eskimos in that region of the eastern Arctic which will be affected by the DEW line and other developments there. The hostels will be constructed by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, which from the first of April this year—this week—will have responsibility for the education of Indians as well as Eskimos in the Northwest Territories. The hostels will be turned over to either the Roman Catholic church or the Anglican church for operation (the Indians and Eskimos are almost entirely of one denomination or the other) according to location and the population to be served. This plan is in accordance with the one that has been followed in the construction of residential schools for Indians in southern Canada for many years. The churches will be paid per pupil grants established on a basis calculated to cover the full cost of maintenance of the children. This is in accordance with the basis on which grants are paid for pupils in residential schools at the present time.

Day schools now exist in all the localities where hostels would be built. These will have to be enlarged. To the extent that the schools are attended by pupils who are the responsibility of the territorial government, a proportionate share of the cost will be recovered from the territorial government.

The details of the program are as follows:—

Fort Smith—hostel for Roman Catholic Indians (initially 200; later 400).

Fort Simpson—1 hostel for Roman Catholic Indians (100); 1 hostel for Anglican Indians (50).

Fort McPherson—hostel for Anglican Indians (100).

Aklavik—1 hostel for Anglican Eskimos (300); 1 hostel for Roman Catholic Indians and Eskimos (200).

I shall mention Frobisher Bay in a moment.

These proposals have been discussed fully with Bishop Marsh of the Church of England and Bishop Trocellier of the Roman Catholic Church. Both agree that it is the program best designed to meet the special needs of the north and to remove difficulties that have been increasing in recent years because of the inadequacy of school facilities in various locations for children of one faith or the other.

In addition to primary education, vocational training will be provided for children who are capable of learning skilled or semi-skilled occupations. At present there are no technical or vocational training schools in the entire Northwest Territories. For this purpose, vocational training schools will be established in Yellowknife, Aklavik and Frobisher Bay. Part of the cost of the schools at Yellowknife and Aklavik will be recovered from the territorial government, in proportion to the extent that non-Indian and non-Eskimo pupils will use them. The school at Frobisher Bay will be entirely for Eskimos. In the initial stages at least it will probably be used for children receiving primary, as well as vocational education.

The hostels I have already mentioned will provide residential facilities for children at Fort Smith, Fort Simpson, Fort McPherson and Aklavik. Hostels will also be constructed at Yellowknife (100 pupils), and at Frobisher Bay (100 pupils).

The above program will be implemented over a period of six years, with the first unit being started during the coming summer—1955. Owing to the suspension of all construction at Aklavik pending the move to the new site, the shortage of educational facilities for Anglican children there is becoming acute. Construction of the proposed hostel at Fort McPerson will relieve the pressure at Aklavik. After the facilities at the new Akalvik have been built, any excess space available in the Fort McPherson hostel can be used for Indians from the northern Yukon, that is the old Crow Indians, (almost entirely Anglican) who at present are almost entirely without educational facilities. For this purpose a supplementary estimate of $120,000 will be required for the fiscal year 1955-56, so that the hostel at Fort McPherson can be available for use by September 1, 1956.

As I have said, a special curriculum is being prepared for Indian, Eskimo and other children in the Northwest Territories who are not likely to go beyond grade school. It will be designed to fit such children for the kinds of employment that are likely to be available in the territories and which do not require advanced general education or specialized vocational training.

Mr. Chairman, I have given an outline of our policy to cope with the human problem and the problem of economic development in the north. I do not believe our plans lack imagination, vigour or aggressiveness.

More details will be available as we consider the votes for the Northern Administration Branch. The amount submitted for this branch this year involves an increase of 57 per cent over 1954-55. I thank you.

My deputy minister would like to make a short statement of clarification.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to say a word, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): Mr. Chairman, the point which the minister wishes me to clarify is in regard to an answer which I gave the other day to a question asked by Mr. Harkness, about the distribution of the staff as between the southern and the northern parts of Canada.

We did not have the exact details available at that time and I gave you some figures which I knew were not entirely accurate. We have now looked into the figures and I can provide accurate ones.

The following is the staff of the northern administration and lands branch as provided for in the 1955-56 estimates: for southern Canada, full time employees, 168; part time employees, 2; seasonal none. Total 170. For northern Canada, full time employees, 213; part time employees, 21; seasonal 89; total 323.

In addition to the foregoing, additional staff will be required to carry out various projects in northern Canada provision for which has been made in the 1955-56 estimates. This staff is not included in the above figures as it is not yet definitely known as to number. We are aware that one particular project (Aklavik) will require a staff of approximately 100 prevailing rate employees, all of whom will be recruited in the Northwest Territories. The final figures will therefore be somewhere in the vicinty of 400 for northern Canada as against 170 for southern Canada.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear those encouraging and constructive words of the minister in recognition of the growing importance of the north in national affairs, and of the greater emphasis which will be placed upon northern development. It is very gratifying to us to hear that kind of information, and I know that the policy you have just outlined is going to be very beneficial to us in the north.

I really do believe that one way of expanding our Northwest Territories in the next fifty years or the next century is to embark upon a wholesale development. Today, and for generations to come there is a job to be done in the

Yukon and in the Northwest Territories, not only for the benefit of present generations, but future generations as well. And I am sure that we all agree that we should reap the harvest of our nothern inheritance by planning wisely, and I believe that is just what the minister is doing and intends to do for the good of our north country.

We need new vision and understanding of what the north can mean to our future as Canadians and to the future of free mankind. We want practical policies and policies that work—policies to roll back the frontiers to give Canada depth as well as breadth. I believe we are all agreed on that point.

The minister mentioned three classes of roads. I suppose that mining roads would come under the heading of resources roads?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS: Is there any provision to assist small mining operators with mining roads into their properties.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. Such roads are not provided for under this policy unless they are what we call resource roads. An access road to a mine is a territorial responsibility just as it is a provincial responsibility in the provinces.

Mr. SIMMONS: Will there be any responsibility on the federal government to assist them in building roads into those properties to which I have referred?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If a road benefits a general area, yes. For instance, you know that in 1955-56 we propose to participate in the cost of a new road from Elsa to Keno City. We will pay 75 per cent of the cost. But it is not an access road to one mine. It will serve several mines, so it is a resource road.

Mr. SIMMONS: I was pleased to hear the minister speak about the high cost of living in the north. The problem of the high cost of living is one of deep concern to us in the north. I believe that is recognized by the fact that the civil servants in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories are paid a subsistence or living allowance.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is the northern allowance.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes; it is $1500 for a married man, and $900 for a single man. I believe that one way to offset this to a certain degree would be to give some relief by allowing a greater income tax deduction for bona fide residents living north of the 60th parallel. I wish the minister would give that some consideration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Some consideration has been given. There are many more complications in the case of the individual income tax than, for instance, in extending the initial period of three years' exemption from corporate income tax for mining concerns.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is one other matter—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Because as you know, Mr. Simmons, the difficulty is where to draw the line. There are some northern places in the provinces where the cost of living is also very high because of the remoteness. It is a very difficult problem.

Mr. SIMMONS: I know it is.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have been studying the situation and studying it with people even from outside. I have been discussing it personally with mine operators in the Yukon and we all agree that it is very difficult to draw a line somewhere.

Mr. SIMMONS: I quite realize the problems in connection with that. There is one further matter, that is the question of a radio station. There is no provision in the estimates, but I thought this would be a good time to say something about it. I am sure the minister and his senior officials realize the necessity of establishing a powerful C.B.C. radio station in the north. We have

been sadly neglected in this respect. I realize this is not a responsibility of your department, but I have every confidence you will support such a worthy and necessary project. Government and commercial radio have really never had any hesitation in meeting the needs of any densely populated area. The people in the north have been completely dependent on their own devices and initiative to provide their own entertainment. Communications are vital for the welfare and development of the north which I am sure you will agree. The people in the north depend on radio as no other people of Canada because of their isolation; they do not have the ready-made amusements which exist in abundance in populated centres of Canada. Radio would bring to them a form of entertainment and information in the world of news, sports, music and other programs originated in Canada. I do not think that any Canadian would begrudge a single penny that would give to these people a tangible liaison with the rest of Canada.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are currently discussing with the C.B.C. the possibilities of radio service to the north. We have examined the possibilities of having stations in the north. This would be extremely costly. Even a station at Yellowknife and a station at Whitehorse would not cover the Mackenzie valley and the whole of the Yukon Territory, and it would be extremely costly to provide programs there. On the other hand, our discussions lead us to believe that one shortwave station beaming programs to the Mackenzie valley and to the Yukon could provide the C.B.C. service to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. According to present estimates, the capital cost would be something more than $1 million. We are currently discussing it with the C.B.C. That is the point which we have reached now.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am sure you will agree that this is a part of Canada in which steps should be taken to integrate the thoughts, pleasures and culture of the people with those of the rest of Canada.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the aim of our present discussion, Mr. Simmons.

Mr. SIMMONS: Thank you.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I hate to be one who throws sour grapes on this program because I am very pleased to see that the minister is enthusiastic about doing something to open up the north. But, it seems to me that the report which he has just given makes it all the more obvious that this committee should pass the motion of non-confidence which I moved last week. This might be an appropriate time to discuss it. I am not impressed with this report despite the fact that before you boil it down perhaps it sounds like you are doing something; however, when you boil it down I am not too convinced that the government still has a program for opening up the north. The minister said we are vigorously pushing ahead a study of the problems. That does not mean too much to me. I would rather he was doing something about it. He said our policy was to create a favourable economic atmosphere. We must again take the argument that is not going to do too much about opening up the north.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of course, you are a socialist and cannot believe in that.

Mr. THATCHER: The minister spoke about his road building program. That is good, but the fact remains that you told us last week in all the Northwest Territories there are only 131 miles of highway, and if I understood it correctly only about 70 miles of that could really be considered as highway; the others are trails and the like.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I did not say that.

Mr. THATCHER: 130 miles of highway in the whole Northwest Territories do not speak very highly for the development which has taken place up to this point. You said we ultimately hope to have a road up to the Great Slave

lake. Again, are we going to have it five years from now or 100 years from now? I think we should do something more than hope. Mr. Simmons wanted a radio station. You said the department is currently discussing it. In other words, the report you have just given seems to be that you are planning for a long time in the future and does not include enough tangible action for this year. I say that regarding the program in the north, if you boil it down, you find simply that people are not going up there. I think it proves that our program must be a failure in view of the fact that other Arctic countries are getting a population; other countries are opening up their north. I do not think in this six year program which you have outlined that we will have many more people at the end of that time than we have today. I give the minister credit for building schools, for paying family allowances and pensions to the native population, and looking after their health, but that is still not looking to the crux of the problem of getting people into the north. I think the report expresses some high hopes but is not good enough in giving us something immediately. I feel strongly that if we do not open up the north country one of these days some other country is going to open it up for us. I do not think this will help very much in getting any more people. We should have a program of opening up the north on a planned basis.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have lived in the Yukon for 50 years and it is only since we have had our present popular minister at the helm that we feel we are really getting places. There has been more done since Mr. Lesage has been in the department than we have ever had done in that country and I have every confidence.

Mr. THATCHER: Do you think it is adequate?

Mr. SIMMONS: You cannot just rush into it. We all have confidence there are going to be big things done in that country.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to see them started.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, but I am saying that they are taking a greater interest in the north and we are going to go places.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: How much more would Mr. Thatcher wish to spend in the north?

Mr. THATCHER: I would like it to be spent more quickly.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are spending $4½ million on Whitehorse.

Mr. THATCHER: You are spending $7 million on northern development.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As I told you the other day, Mr. Thathcer, the expenditures do not all come in the estimates of my department, which is a department of coordination and administration of the north; a great part of the expenditures come from other departments, and they are much higher than $7 million; they are much more than double that amount. Consider, for instance, that there is going to be built at Whitehorse this year a $3 million hospital which will be constructed by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. THATCHER: That is good.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is good, and it is one of the ways and means of providing facilities which will bring people to the north; but you cannot do everything at the same time. The whole thing has to be planned and studied. Of course Mr. Thatcher, for you in the opposition it is very easy to criticize. But if we make blunders in our planning you will be the first to reproach us. Therefore we have to study, and study carefully, all the proposals we make so that the expenditures may be justified. We are doing more on a federal basis in the north than we are doing elsewhere in Canada, and I agree that this should be the case. But the expenditures are made at the cost of the taxpayers of Canada, and they should be made in such a way that they will

form the basis for a sound economic development. This expenditure in the Yukon, the relocation of the town of Aklavik, the new education program, all these schemes and others are going to cost millions of dollars and still more is being set aside for expenditure in years to come. In this department only, and in this year only, there is a 57 per cent increase over last year's expenditure. You will surely agree, Mr. Thatcher, that you cannot really go beyond the point in increasing expenditure where those expenditures can reasonably be absorbed.

Mr. THATCHER: May I make a suggestion Mr. Minister—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Take for instance, the situation if a C.B.C. short-wave station is built for the north. The expenditure would not be in my estimates, it would be in the estimates of the C.B.C.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Sinclair, the Minister of Fisheries, is going to Russia and I understand he is coming back by way of Siberia. I suggest you get him to ask the Russians to show him just how they are opening up their northland.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It was based at the beginning on forced labour in Siberia, and you know that Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. THATCHER: Some of it was, but not most of it. Do not be too proud to learn some ideas.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Secondly, you can settle people there in large numbers in connection with farming, because the climatic conditions in some parts there allow it. But the climate would allow it only over a small area in the Northwest Territories. It is not the same at all. The development of our northland will be based, as I have repeatedly said, on mining development which is quite a different process of development than the development of land for farming purposes, as you are doing in the west, and as they find possible in the northern parts of the Scandinavian countries. Moreover, in Russia they have had for a number of years an additional factor—the pressure of population from the south. In Scandinavia and in Russia they were also under a necessity to tap the natural resources of their northlands, whereas the necessity of doing so in Canada was not felt to anything like such an extent because of our great reserves of natural resources in the provinces—reserves which are as yet tapped on only a very small scale. The situations are not comparable at all, and I believe I can appeal to you, Mr. Thatcher, to understand—I am dealing with this in all frankness—that your motion is coming in the year when most is being done.

Mr. THATCHER: You mean there has been even less done than this in the past?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know that, Mr. Thatcher. The prime minister himself said in the House in December, 1953, when the name of the department was changed, that it seemed as if we had treated our north in a "state of absence of mind."

Mr. THATCHER: Would not my motion be helpful in encouraging you in your proposed development?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. It would really be a motion of no confidence, and if it were carried I would have no alternative but to resign.

Mr. THATCHER: I would not want that.

Mr. HELLYER: What is Mr. Thatcher doing to increase the population of the northland?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe if you were at the helm, Mr. Thatcher, you could do better than is being done now.

Mr. HARKNESS: As indicated by the minister, Mr. Chairman, there are really two main things to be considered here. One is the economic development of the northland, and the means to be taken to bring that about. This is the matter in which I think Mr. Thatcher is primarily interested, and perhaps properly so far as the development of our country is concerned. The other problem has to do with the native population—providing them with education and some means by which they can make a regular living. These two questions are related to a certain extent, but to a large extent they are separate problems. As far as looking after the education of Indians and providing them with a livelihood is concerned, the minister gave a report in connection with the reorganization of the educational system which is taking place, and which is coming into effect I understand this week. Up to this time, as I understand it, the education of the Indians has been the responsibility of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: And if I understand your report correctly, you are taking over that responsibility from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Northwest Territories.

Mr. HARKNESS: That also applies to the Yukon does it not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, not the Yukon. You see, the Indians there are mainly, as I said the other day, close to the border of British Columbia in the southern part of the Yukon, although there are a certain number at Old Crow in the north center of the Yukon.

Mr. HARKNESS: So that the education of the Indians in the Yukon will remain the responsibility of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about the Eskimos in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are only very few on Herschel Island, and they are our responsibility.

Mr. HARKNESS: All Eskimos are your responsibility?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. Even in Quebec.

Mr. HARKNESS: I was glad to hear that considerably more is going to be done so far as the Indians and Eskimos are concerned than was the case in the past, and I think the general plan which the minister has outlined of doing away with the straight residential church schools as the main means of educating Indians and providing day schools and hostels in which the children may live is probably the correct answer. I understand the schools are going to be run entirely by your department.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, except in the school districts of Yellowknife.

Mr. HARKNESS: They are inter-denominational?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Non-denominational.

Mr. HARKNESS: Day schools?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Except that when the school children are all Catholic the teachers will be Catholic, and when the children are all Anglican the teachers will be Anglican.

Mr. DUPUIS: Or a large majority.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Are you taking over the present educational staff which the Department of Indian Affairs has in that area?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: You absorb them?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: And what about the rates of pay and things of that sort as far as the teachers are concerned? Do the teachers become or remain civil servants?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They were and they remain civil servants.

Mr. HARKNESS: All of the teachers will be civil servants?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: And the authority of the churches so far as education is concerned will be confined to the hostels?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To the hostels. There may be some religious instruction during the day for the students of each religion. It is usual to allow a half-hour each day for religious instruction. Those children who are not of the faith for which this religious half-hour is given leave the school.

Mr. HARKNESS: That religious instruction will be in the school, not in the hostel? My understanding of the projected plan here was that the religious instruction would be given in the hostels.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It could be given in the school.

Mr. SIMMONS: Your policy, then, is to create employment for the Indians who will work, in other words, the non-trappers?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, the Indians and Eskimos.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is a very good thing.

Mr. THATCHER: What, specifically, are you doing along those lines? We are paying a large amount to Eskimos for relief purposes. Are you trying to persuade them to help with your highway program?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are no roads where the Eskimos live. I believe that you should withdraw your motion, come up to the north with me and bring your motion in next year. You would not move such a motion if you had been to the north. There are no roads in Eskimo country. You asked me a question—

Mr. THATCHER: You have not answered it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you will permit me, what we are doing is this. For the surplus population, that is to say for the Eskimos who, because of the increase in population, cannot live on the limited wild life in the north, we are trying to provide occupations in other fields. I shall give you an example of what is going on for instance with regard to the DEW line. We have now six northern service officers who are working closely with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Eskimos can be hired on the DEW line with the approval of an official of this department. If an Eskimo is a good hunter and has been up to now providing for his family with his native skill, and if he can continue to do so, we do not want to make him work for such a length of time on defence installations that he might lose his skills. On the other hand, there are young Eskimos who are promising young men, whose employment we can allow, with the prospect that they are clever enough and good workers enough that they will continue to be regularly employed, even after the line has been constructed. All this has to be weighed, and care is being taken to ensure that the employment of Eskimos on the DEW line is controlled by the northern service officers of our department, so that their way of life will not be disrupted, and so that, on the other hand, we can see that those who are in a position to do so have open to them other ways of making living in the future.

Mr. THATCHER: The Lapps in northern Finland, if I understand correctly, had quite a successful program of raising reindeer or something of that kind. Can you tell us if your department has been trying to do something along those lines?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have been more than trying. We have been doing it for a number of years.

Mr. THATCHER: Would you tell us about that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. We have a reindeer station at the northeast tip of the Mackenzie delta, and there is a large area east of the Mackenzie delta where we have one main government herd of reindeer, and four herds managed by Eskimos. This year we have given a fifth herd to two Eskimos to manage together. I believe I could read you a memo which I have here on reindeer management, if it would be of interest?

Mr. THATCHER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In pursuance of a recommendation by a royal commission, and under extensive field investigations, arrangements were made in 1929 for the purchase of a herd of reindeer from Alaska upon the delivery of the animals to the Canadian range. The purpose was to augment the means of livelihood of the Eskimos and Indians and conserve the game resources on which they depended. An area on the east side of the Mackenzie river delta was reserved for reindeer grazing. Some Lapp herders and their families were brought from Norway as trainers.

It was realized at the outset that this would be a long-range project and that the task of converting traditional hunters and trappers to herders would be beset with many trials and setbacks. The method of development was patterned largely on procedures in Alaska particularly with regard to corralling methods, and rewarding suitable trained natives with grants of reindeer. Serious difficulties which arose in Alaska were studied for causes of failure and efforts were made in Canada to avoid various pitfalls, including the one of permitting white and native ownership of reindeer in the same area, which had aroused much confusion and controversy and resulted in the U.S. government buying out the non-native owners.

The selected pasturage in Canada proved suitable, and a routine of seasonal migration was worked out with summer grazing on the coast and winter grazing 50-100 miles inland where moss was abundant. In view of a generally good fur yield and high fur prices which prevailed for some years, it was difficult to attract the most capable natives to reindeer herding. Most of those who accepted reindeer employment and training were of mediocre ability. The result was many frustrations and disappointments for those in charge of reindeer administration and field work. As the reindeer preferred the open tundra to bush country it soon became evident that recruits for reindeer herding would be Eskimos with Indians not much interested. The availability of apprentice herders has altered materially in recent years as the fur catch and prices declined and as registered trapping areas were introduced. There is now no difficulty in filling vacancies on the reindeer staff.

Some early ventures were made in the management of the reindeer by Eskimos in the Anderson river area, but these met with disaster in a shipwreck which cost the lives of a white supervisor, two Eskimo herders, and several members of the herders' families. There was a lull in starting new herds, but the scheme was revived in 1948 and there are now a main government herd and four native units all located in the reserve, which was enlarged in 1952 to 17,000 square miles.

We have now one main herd and four native herds containing about 8,000 animals. A considerable number have strayed from these herds, and the total of animals is perhaps about 11,000.

Mr. THATCHER: Is it feasible to keep these herds in most areas of the Northwest Territory, or are you limited to certain areas? Could you diversify that or not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Colonel Cunningham, the heard of the Northern Administration and Lands Branch, could answer this question much more easily.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman. reindeer can be successfully herded anywhere where caribou run. Caribou run almost everywhere north of the tree line. While the quality of the grazing differs in various places, our problem is not one of suitable grazing land, but one of getting the Eskimos interested in adopting the rather dull life of herding. They are accustomed to living on the produce of their hunting, moving from place to place from season to season in accordance with the abundance of game in a particular season. They like that sort of life. They do not like to be tied to the tails of a few thousand reindeer and to have to keep them together and protect them from wolves, and so on. We have more reindeer available and have had for twenty years, than we have Eskimos whom we can induce to enter into that rather dull life.

Mr. THATCHER: Colonel, is it feasible to have more herds in a small community or not?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Normally, we find that two Eskimo families are the minimum number that should be asked to take care of any herd. 2,000 animals will give them a good living off the increase of the herd.

Mr. THATCHER: I do not follow you there.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Communal herding does not meet with success. Even in Lapland, I think you will find that the herds are privately owned, not communally owned.

Mr. THATCHER: We were talking earlier about farming. Why would it not be feasible to introduce herds into these other areas?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Reindeeer and farming do not go together. Reindeer live on the tundra, and farming is done in the southern parts where you have soil. I believe, Mr. Thatcher, that you should come up north with me.

Mr. HARKNESS: This reindeer experiment has gone on for a number of years, and I have been disappointed that it has not gone ahead much faster than it has. It seems to have gone very slowly. As I understand it, the reason for that is the difficulty you have had in securing suitable herders. The chief difficulty as far as the Eskimos are concerned, is to supply them with a sure source of food. It has always seemed to me that reindeer provided the best answer to what you might call at least subsistence, as far as food is concerned, for the northern Eskimo population. Therefore perhaps greater effort should have been made to get the reindeer spread right across the northern area instead of being confined as they are, to where they started in the Aklavik area. Now, has any effort been made to move some of these reindeer over into the eastern Arctic, to get the Eskimos in the eastern Arctic started on this reindeer herding project?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: None have been so moved in the past. The reason is that there is very little hope of attracting Eskimos to this way of making a living, if they can make a living by hunting. We are at the present time giving consideration to establishing a berd in an area of the eastern Arctic, perhaps Southampton Island, where the hunting way of life is not as good as it used to be. It may be that next year we will have such a scheme included in our estimates, but so far it has not been done. I would like to repeat that our difficulty is not one of finding places where reindeer can live. Our difficulty is a psychological and social one. The herder's life is so different from the traditional Eskimo life, that it is very difficult to persuade the Eskimo to take up that way of life.

Mr. SIMMONS: Can you tell us the number of the reindeer population in Alaska.

Mr. F. J. G. CUNNINGHAM (*Director, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): It is very small. I think it is down to around 30,000 as against a million or so some years ago.

Mr. HARKNESS: What do you think would account for that decline?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Over-grazing; herds were permitted to increase beyond the capacity of the available grazing land, and within a period of three years from 75 to 80 per cent died of starvation.

Mr. HARKNESS: They increased in Alaska in large numbers. Is there any possibility of letting them run wild in the Arctic areas and increase there in the same way in which they increased in Alaska, and therefore provide a means of subsistence to Indians and Eskimos by hunting which is their traditional way of life?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I do not think so. They are domestic animals and should be kept together for protection against wolves. There would not appear to be any great advantage in turning our comparatively small number of reindeer loose. There are not more than 11,000, and we have approximately 800,000 caribou already in the north.

Mr. HARKNESS: The number of caribou has been decreasing, has it not? That is one of the reasons there has been a lot of starvation among the Eskimo?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: No, I do not think so. The number of caribou which once roamed the north is not known with accuracy. There seems to have been some reduction in the number over the last fifty years. The reason for occasional starvation among the Eskimo who subsist in large part on caribou is that the migration paths change. The Eskimo usually has only two opportunities a year in which to take caribou; on their way north, and on their way south, and if he does not get enough caribou when they are going through, then he does not make a good kill. We had that situation in the winter of 1954-55. The Eskimo at Coronation gulf were hunting caribou and they said there were none there. But airplane reconnaissance established the fact that within fifty miles there was a substantial herd. And once that was pointed out to the Eskimo, they were able to move to them and they did make a good kill.

Mr. HARKNESS: I have a few more questions about reindeer. I think you said that it required 2,000 animals to maintain two families. In other words, that is 1,000 animals per family. What is the reason for that? Consider the fact that when cattle are concerned, 1,000 head of cattle would maintain quite a large number of people from the point of view of meat supply, milk supply, and so forth.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: An Eskimo should use only the annual increase of his herd. He uses the meat for himself and for feed for his dogs. He uses the hides for clothing, for tents, and for sleeping skins.

As to the number he requires—Mr. Hardie can give better figures than I—but I think an Eskimo family needs from 70 to 100 caribou a year, and that is pretty close to the annual increase on 1,000 reindeer.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the increase per thousand of reindeer?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I think it is around 12 per cent.

Mr. HARKNESS: Their increase is not as great as it is with cattle.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: No.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any reason for that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Around half of the 1,000 animals would be female, say 500. Maybe 300 of those would be of calf bearing capacity. At most there is one calf per year per producing cow. Allowing for loss to predators and other accidents you get down to perhaps a potential calf population of 250 per thousand animals per year. That is your potential. In practice the number that reach yearling stage and can be economically slaughtered are not much more than 50 per cent of that. There are such things as strays, which cannot be avoided, disease, and of course the predators.

Mr. SIMMONS: Has any thought been given to establishing a herd of these reindeer in the Yukon Territories?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: No. I do not think that the terrain in the Yukon is suitable for reindeer.

Mr. SIMMONS: It might be around the Old Crow area.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Possibly there.

Mr. SIMMONS: Can these Indians in the Yukon cross over into the Northwest Territories and take the reindeer from the run there?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Reindeer or caribou?

Mr. SIMMONS: Reindeer.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: So far utilization of reindeer has been limited to Eskimos, and there are no Eskimos living in the Yukon.

Mr. HARKNESS: Has there ever been any estimate of the number of reindeer the north could support?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: No, but probably 2 or 3 million.

Mr. HARKNESS: I remember something by Stefansson who at one time predicted that the north could support quite a few millions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I picked the figure I did because it is approximately the number of caribou who are thought able to live on the range available and I think you could equate reindeer with caribou.

Mr. THATCHER: When you have Indians on relief do you not exert pressure on them to take some reindeer for their own use?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Indians do not live above the tree line.

Mr. THATCHER: I am sorry, I meant Eskimos.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Pressure is something which we are not permitted to use.

Mr. THATCHER: If we are paying taxpayer's money to keep them on relief the least we can ask them to do is help themselves.

Mr. HARDIE: In this reindeer raising ground, it is not only the few families who are looking after 2,000 reindeer who benefit from them, but there is also a government herd there which supports I think close to 24 families, 12 who actually work plus their children, and the meat from this herd is used by people who work in the reindeer range. On top of that the excess meat is sold and distributed to Aklavik and Fort McPherson and at these places not only the native Eskimo but also the native Indian can purchase it. I would like to say something further about this. The price that is being paid presently in Aklavik and McPherson is in my estimation far too high. I think possibly the department would be wise in slaughtering these reindeer and when they do slaughter them they should do it in such a way that they can sell this reindeer meat to the people at Aklavik and Fort McPherson—the Indians and Eskimos—at cost. Up until now that has not been done and I am hoping that the department will consider this and sell this reindeer meat at cost to these native people. There is no use in selling it to the Hudson's Bay Company and allowing them to put their markup on it. I think in Aklavik in the last few years we have not sold half the reindeer meat there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are now considering building a government abattoir in Aklavik.

Mr. THATCHER: That is a tangible which you had not mentioned.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said at the end of my remarks that there was a lot more explanation which would be given as we went over the votes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Might I give some figures to Mr. Harkness. We have one herd comprising 1,800 animals which had a kill of 113; another comprising 2,800 had a kill of 123.

Mr. HARKNESS: The increase has been very small. There are only 11,000 animals now, whereas in Alaska apparently these reindeer increased to such an extent that they had to be killed off.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: They started with a much larger basic stock in Alaska and turned the industry over to white ranchers. We, on the other hand, have kept the total number of reindeer down by deliberately slaughtering the excess because there is no purpose in the government maintaining very large herds as government herds. Our purpose is to induce the Eskimos to take on the management of family herds themselves. As I said before, we are limited not by grazing availability, but by the number of Eskimos whom we can interest in this way of life. That is in one phrase the whole reason why our herds are not larger and why this enterprise has not been more successful. It is enormously difficult to persuade Eskimos to become herders.

Mr. HARKNESS: You have had these reindeer in only a limited area because the number of Eskimos on whom you were looking to become herders happened to be in an area where there was large muskrat trapping, and they were not interested in herding. It seems to me that perhaps the best method would be to move more of these reindeer eastward where the trapping possibilities were perhaps not as good as around Aklavik.

Mr. HARDIE: I do not think that is true because many of these herders working in herding reindeer do not have trap lines.

Mr. HARKNESS: The reason that the Eskimos have not been interested is that they have been able to trap.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I was going to say that there seems to be a great deal of sense in what has been said.

Mr. HARKNESS: That they should be moved eastwards.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am glad to hear now that there is a plan on foot to move some of these eastward. It seems to me that apart from providing relief the only way that these Eskimos are ever going to become self supporting is by the provision of a basic food supply which they can produce themselves, and the only possibility in that line, are reindeer, caribou and muskox.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And fish.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes. Therefore it seems to me that the basic effort in so far as improving the general lot of the Eskimos is concerned should be confined to providing basic food supplies for them or the means of their securing it. Along that line is there anything being done to ensure that the cariboo herds are brought within reach of the Eskimos who might wish to hunt them for food? Is anything being done to try to steer those herds towards where the Eskimos live, or anything being done in the matter of moving the Eskimos to where the herds are running. This is not fanciful at all, in my opinion, because there are aeroplanes going over that region all the time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have just had an example of what is being done.

Mr. HARKNESS: These aeroplanes could spot the caribou herds and if information was given to the Eskimos they might possibly find their way to the spot where they could kill the caribou. You mentioned about their being 50 miles away and starving, a short while ago. I was wondering what could be done along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: May I say first of all that we cannot put up guide posts or direction signs to influence the caribou into changing their course of migration, though many white men in the north would welcome such a thing. Mr. Hardie will remember a year when the caribou overran Fort Resolution and the people simply had to go into their houses and lock themselves inside and hope for the best because the herd was going right through the town, and there was great fear and justified fear.

There is, however, a great deal of sense in the suggestion which has been made that we should try to steer the Eskimo to the caribou. We are doing that increasingly as aircraft become available for the purpose. The area which causes us the most concern is in the interior of Keewatin. There the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have recently provided an aircraft, which they use part of the time to assist us in our work. That aircraft could, perhaps, be increasingly used to assist in bringing about this desirable liaison between the hunter and the hunted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you finished, Mr. Hardie?

Mr. HARDIE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is being done as far as the muskox is concerned?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: They are wholly protected. There was a great deal of fear that they were a vanishing species. However, Mr. Mair, the chief of the Wilf Life Service, gave these figures last year. There are something like 10,000 or 12,000 muskox scattered throughout the north. The largest concentration is in the Thelon Game Sanctuary where there are approximately 800. The next largest concentration is in the Hardie river country where there are approximately 200, and in the region north of the Great Bear lake there is another herd of 100. In addition, herds of varying sizes have been observed on Bathurst island, Melville island, Ellesmere Island and Banks Island. So far our policy has been simply to try to prevent the killing of musk oxen for any purpose.

In the year 1954, with the approval of our minister, a team of American scientists were permitted, as was reported in the newspapers, to take a few calves which are now in Vermont where studies are being made of the possibility of domesticating them and interbreeding them with some species of domestic cattle. There are two possibilities—one that the herds may increase to such an extent that utilization of their meat by hunters may be possible. That, I think, is a long way in the future. The other possibility is the creation of a domestic animal which will have good meat qualities and good wool qualities, and which we can introduce increasingly as time goes on to the Eskimo as a domestic animal. That I am afraid is also a long way in the future. I may say that this question of providing domestic animals for the Eskimos has caused us a great deal of concern. We have looked into a number of possibilities including yaks, lamas, sheep and goats. In 1955 the first experiment of moving sheep into Eskimo territory will be carried on at Fort Chimo.

Mr. YUILL: A part of the question I was going to ask has already been answered. I understood the minister to say that the remuneration of those Eskimos who are charged with the responsibility of guarding these herds was geared to the equivalent of the net increase. I am curious to know how that

division of the spoils is arrived at. Is it reached on a per capita basis or do you pay them in cash or meat? I gather that they take their payments in meat. How do you arrive at the division of the spoils?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: A distinction must be made between herdsmen minding their own herds and those who are looking after government herds. Animal herding is a skilled occupation. One must take an Eskimo and give him several years' training before he is competent to look after his own herd. During that period of training the Eskimo is a civil servant and is employed at a salary. He does get some meat but this is not his principal source of livelihood. His principal source of livelihood is his salary. After he has proved himself we establish him with a native herd. The size of the herd varies from 1,000 to 2,000 animals depending on the circumstances. He takes the herd under an agreement whereby he is permitted to kill and use a proportion of the natural increase. He is supposed to retain part of the natural increase in order to reimburse the main government herd for the animals which he has been given without any cash payment. After he has paid off the loan, then, if he is a prudent man, the herdsman will maintain his capital intact and only live on the increase. As I say, that increase—the utilizable part—runs from 70 to 100 animals per year. This is roughly the same amount as a native hunting family requires if it lives on the killing of caribou.

Mr. YUILL: Thank you.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I was wondering if there were many films taken by the National Film Board in recent years showing the present state of development in the northern territories?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are two excellent recent films about Eskimo life. One is called "Angotee" and the other "Land of the Long Day".

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Would not members of the committee be interested, at the end of our meetings, if these films could be shown to them? They would complete the information which we have received.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will take that request into account, Mr. Deschatelets. Mr. Cunningham is going to try to communicate with the National Film Board and we shall seek to arrange a suitable time to show these two films to members of the committee.

Mr. HENRY: This press release entitled "New Program in the Northwest Territories" describes the program over a six year period. I was wondering if you could give the total estimated cost of the program.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Including Aklavik, I suppose roughly, it would be between $8 and $10 million.

Mr. HENRY: That includes everything spoken about in this memorandum and press release No. 3555?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Capital cost only.

Mr. HENRY: Is there any memorandum available which breaks down that figure, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: These figures have to be revised each year. They are very rough guesses.

Mr. HENRY: That is all right. I understand you have a problem there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know, Mr. Henry, that building in the north is not easy. It is costly and it is always difficult to determine exactly in advance what an establishment will cost.

Mr. HENRY: I see, thank you.

Mr. HARDIE: In the minister's statement he said that there was to be a reduction of northern transportation rates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are having a meeting next week. We have already held a preliminary meeting, and we are having another next week. We are working hard at this, Mr. Hardie.

Mr. HARDIE: I was glad to hear that. It was also mentioned that the Air Transport Board had a new tariff.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is my information.

Mr. HARDIE: Does that affect air cargo and passengers, or strictly cargo?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe it is on both, but I am not sure of that answer. The information I have came on an informal basis.

Mr. HARDIE: I feel that Mr. Thatcher in some ways is right with regard to the populating of the north. First we have to have transportation before we can get population.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I agree.

Mr. HARDIE: However, I feel that north of the part that is served by water or by highway, we could build roads right now, for instance, north of Yellowknife, between Yellowknife and the east arm of Great Slave lake. That area is rich in gold, copper, lead and fish, and at the same time it would look after the human element. I think the minister has said that the expenditure on relief has increased and is increasing. Would it not be possible to put these people to work on building roads rather than having them on relief? I am sure that the natives themselves would much rather work for what they can get than take handouts.

The CHAIRMAN: Were you going to make a comment on that?

Mr. HARDIE: The minister said that the population of the north was increasing. I agree. In the Aklavik area the population has increased in the past four or five years to such an extent that there are large numbers of natives, Indians and Eskimos, who are today without trap lines. Now, I was wondering, since the minister did say that the development rests in mining and in production of oil—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Primarily.

Mr. HARDIE: —Primarily, and that this population that is already in the north has increased now,—and we have problems now,—we are increasing our problems as the population grows.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARDIE: As this increase of population goes on, we are going to have all these problems on the Arctic coast, particularly around Aklavik and those areas. Has the minister thought of building roads to develop the mineral section and then moving these people into that section,—because development of these mineral areas has to go along at the same rate of speed as the increase in our population?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Certainly I have thought of it. One of the projects which I have in mind as a possibility for road construction is the one you have mentioned, a road from Yellowknife northeast to Fort Reliance, to the mineralized areas near Prosperous Lake, Gordon lake, and Indian Mountain lake. That is the area you have in mind, is it not?

Mr. HARDIE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is a possibility.

Mr. HARDIE: If this population is increasing, we should be doing something about it now. Do you not feel that we should make an early start on this sort of project?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We will certainly consider your suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS: Has any thought been given to construction of a road from Hay river to Mills lake, which would give earlier navigation down the Mackenzie river?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, definitely. An oil company is beginning a road from Hay river this year.

Mr. SIMMONS: It is only about thirty miles, is it not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Over a hundred miles. The distances are tremendous up there. From an aeroplane it might look like twenty miles.

Mr. CHURCHILL: This particular section of the estimates covers so many problems that they get into a disorderly session. I wanted to ask some more questions regarding the native population, but we are getting into roads, air transport and so on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We can call the votes item by item. I am in the hands of the committee.

Mr. HARKNESS: These things do not come under the votes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are matters of general discussion more than anything else.

The CHAIRMAN: We will come to some of these items later in the estimates.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I might as well continue my questions on the native population, as we have had quite a bit about that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would appertain to general discussion.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You told us that there are approximately 7,000 Eskimos in the Northwest Territories.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are more than that if you include the Eskimos that live in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You did not give me that figure the other day.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You did not ask for the total number of Eskimos. You asked for the total population of the Northwest Territories. That has about 7,000 Eskimos. There are about 2,000 Eskimos living in northern Quebec.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do you deal with them also?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. That makes a total of about 9,000.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Of that 9,000 Eskimo population, what percentage would you consider to be self-supporting?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: They are all self-supporting except in years when they cannot get cash from the sale of white foxes or when the animals of the sea and land on which they subsist fail. We have very few instances of Eskimos who are able-bodied sitting down and waiting for government handouts. In those few cases we exert very strong pressure. No person is given relief at government expense unless the local agent of the administration, who may be a mounted policeman, is completely satisfied that he cannot get the food he needs by hunting. There is no pampering.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Then the Eskimo does not normally create any problem except when there is a failure of food supply or when his hunting is interfered with?

Hon. MR. LESAGE: That is right, but the population is increasing, and our policy of trying to diversify their occupations is intended to enable this increase in population, which might not be able to make a living from the limted supplies of wild life, to be gainfully employed.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Your problem is as you indicate on page 27 of your report: "While progress in dealing with a primitive people must necessarily be slow, the steps that are now being taken to diversify the economy and to provide

education and technical training will in time provide those who must remain as hunters and trappers with a higher standard of living and those others, who are so inclined, with opportunities for taking up other forms of gainful employment." You are dealing with a population of hunters, who perhaps are more satisfied with that type of life than any other?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe so.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are the necessary steps being taken to preserve their hunting facilities? For example, Mr. Harkness was talking about the caribou a little while ago. Many of the Eskimos, from what I have read, have been very much dependent on the caribou.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mainly on the continent, not on the islands.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On the islands, they are dependent upon fishing.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Seal hunting and whale hunting.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would take it that those on the islands create no problem.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: They create less of a problem, but in some instances there is a problem. It is most difficult to generalize on this question of what to do for the Eskimos. Basically we divide them into three general categories.

First, there are the Eskimos who live in remote areas, where there is very little influence upon their traditional way of life through encroachment of the white man. In those areas our policy is to continue them in their nomadic hunting life.

In places where there are insufficient natural resources available to them, we do several things to cure the situation. One is to encourage their migration to a new area where resources are abundant. We have done so several times in the last few years with excellent results. For example, some Eskimos have recently moved from the east coast of Hudson Bay to Cornwallis Island, where Eskimos used to live but where there have been none for several hundred years.

Then, second, there are Eskimos who have been brought into what now appears to be permanent contact with the white man's economy. For example, Fort Chimo at the southern end of Frobisher bay, and the Aklavik and Tuktoyaktuk area. It is recognized that we must do something more than simply keep them to their primitive way of life. We provide them with employment whenever we are satisfied that they can do a job which is available to be done, and we are starting to train them so that they may take better employment. This process actually began about three years ago, but it has already resulted in a number of Eskimo families being given permanent employment in gainful occupation for cash. That number, which is around fifty, will very greatly increase over the years, partly on account of the defence installations, and partly on account of mining activities. For example, I might mention the Belcher Islands, where there are iron ore discoveries, and where there may be employment for a large number of Eskimo in the future.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In Hudson's bay.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I might mention also Rankin Inlet, where a nickel mine is now in operation and where controlled employment has been afforded for a number of Eskimo living in the vicinity of the mine. Those instances will multiply.

In addition, we are giving advanced training to suitable Eskimos. We are extremely proud of the fact that Thomas Aneroluk, an Eskimo from Coppermine, has gone through public school, high school, and trade school and is now a radio technician permanently employed by the Department of Transport in the north. He is the first man we have trained, and there will be more.

We are bringing young and suitable Eskimo girls out for training as nurses aides, having in mind that they will return to the north where they can do as good a job as imported white persons can do. Wherever we can we are trying to integrate the Eskimo with the permanent white civilization.

Another illustration of that is at Churchill, where there is now a permanent military installation. Three years ago there were no Eskimos employed there, while today I think they have seventeen men. These Eskimos come all the way from a spot one thousand miles away at the south end of Ungava Bay, where times are very bad. We persuaded them to migrate and they are now successfully integrated into the permanent white man's economy at Fort Churchill. In the future, instances of that sort will multiply.

There is a third class somewhere in between the primitive and the man who is over-run by white civilization, and this is perhaps the most difficult category of Eskimo to care for wisely. I am talking now about the Eskimo who has been brought into contact with the white man's way of life, but we are not sure yet that the coming of the white man into his particular area is permanent. For example, take the Eskimos living in the part of the north where the distant warning line crosses. The Eskimos can be given short term employment, but the problem is whether an Eskimo who has received a substantial amount of cash for a year or two will be willing to go back to the kind of life he formerly followed. Let us say that he has earned $6,000 in one year. Can we expect him to give up his acquired taste for good clothes, good food, radios, and all sorts of white man's luxuries and go back to a hunting existence and be satisfied with meat and fish? That is a most difficult problem for us to deal with. We are trying to meet it by controlling the white man's contact with the Eskimo. We are not gainsaying him gainful employment, but we establish conditions of employment so that he will have, for example, enough time off to go hunting and to retain his skills.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You have moved certain Eskimo to an island where they can continue as hunters; and secondly, you have moved Eskimo 1,000 miles to a centre of white civilization. Why should that be?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The first group is primitive with little education. From Hudson's bay up to northern areas where game is more available; for instance, the area between Ungava and Hudson's bay, was overrun with caribou one hundred years ago, while today there are practically none. It is the primitives that we have moved from that southern part to far northern points.

The Eskimo we moved to Churchill came from the southern end of Ungava bay, from the area where during the last war there was a great air base; and then when those people went away, the natives were left without employment.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Is the general policy of the department to provide every opportunity for the Eskimo to continue as a hunter?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That comes first, does it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It depends on circumstances.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I know, but that would be the over-all policy?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not the policy at Aklavik. You cannot have a general policy for all Eskimos. You have to have a policy for each of the three groups of Eskimo, according to which group they belong. I thought that Mr. Cunningham's explanation of the three different groups of Eskimo and of the policy which is applied in respect to each group was very clear.

Mr. CHURCHILL: As the north is opened up, then increasingly the white man's civilization is going to encroach upon the Eskimo.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what I said in my statement on education.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are you going to endeavor to retain for the Eskimo his existence as a hunter, either by putting restrictions on certain areas, or by moving men to other places?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To the extent it can be done. In certain places, such as Frobisher Bay, for instance, it is inevitable that the Eskimos will come into contact with white men; and at Aklavik it is the same, as it is at other places. For example, take the case of the Dew line; we are going to try to see to it that we do not have camp followers around the bases which are being built, and we are going to try to keep the Eskimos away from the construction camps, for the good reason that we want them to keep to their normal way of life, which is hunting. And we have had, as I said the other day, the best of cooperation from the general contractors up there in keeping the Eskimos away from the construction camps, except those who under the conditions mentioned by Mr. Cuningham are going to be employed in the construction.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have two or three more qestions, but I see that it is 12.30.

The CHAIRMAN: I see that there is another administraton branch under "Northern Administration and Lands Branch". I take it we have been in fact dealing with 312 and 314 and we will continue on them and then take 313, "Lands Division", after we get through with them.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you mind if we kept the Lands Division for the last? There are really two divisions in this branch; there is the Territorial Division, the northern administration division, and the Lands Division. If I may I would suggest that we go through all the votes which deal with northern administration, which are all the votes under this Branch except 313, which deals with the Lands Division and could come last.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest that.

Mr. SIMMONS: I will be leaving tomorrow evening and I wonder if it would be possible to study the Yukon estimates first.

The CHAIRMAN: I know that the members wish to deal with this and take the time to deal with it because it is interesting and important. The minister said he will make a special effort to be here both this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon, so we will sit both this afternoon, tomorrow morning and tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. SIMMONS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet this afternoon at 3.30.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. We are still on items 312 and 314.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, while we were on this item last week in committee I announced the fact that consideration should be given to the possibility of constructing a road either from Dawson City or Mayo into the Mackenzie river delta.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I had not quite finished my questions on the Eskimos. Would it not be better to finish the questions on the Eskimos first?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I think that Mr. Simmons' questions would come much more easily on the Yukon vote, if you do not mind, Mr. Simmons.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is all right.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As to the native population, especially the Eskimo population, we could take that under the Arctic division vote, which is 314 and has been called. I believe we should deal at this time with the native population.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not wish to interfere with any other questioning. However, I have just three or four other questions left on this subject. What is concerning me is this question of livelihood for the Eskimo. I think the concern of the department is that the Eskimo population should not suffer as in the past the Indian population of Canada has suffered at times. In respect to the Eskimo living in the northern part of Quebec I think some statement was given in respect to the fact that the caribou had pretty well been reduced in numbers to such an extent that the Eskimo population was in difficulty. What is the reason for the disappearance of the caribou?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: A major one is probably excessive killing by hunters. Before the rifle was brought into the north the population of both caribou and Eskimos was in a nice state of balance. The Eskimo was able to take all he needed to live without unduly depleting the caribou. But the introduction of the rifle led to depletion by overkilling. It is literally true that you will not find any caribou in the interior of Quebec except an odd one in the interior. We have a number of measures underway or planned, to compensate for the loss of this main food resource.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Is there any possibility of re-stocking that area with caribou?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It has been considered but we have not attempted it. The number we could take, for example, by catching caribou in Keewatin and shipping them down by rail to Churchill and loading them on cattleships and sending them to the eastern shore would provide a very very slow way of reviving the caribou population. There are other things that we think are more feasible. For example, the Eskimos who live on the east coast of Hudson Bay have never availed themselves as they could have of the resources of the sea. They were land hunters traditionally, not water hunters. We are now endeavouring to interest them in taking the seal and the walrus, and are providing them with boats and teaching them how to use boats and harpoons. They do not have the immediate adaptability which white people do and it is not easy.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It seems a shame that we have to get them to adapt themselves to other ways when in their natural state they were perhaps a self supporting group. With respect to the tribes on the other side of Hudson's Bay are they in danger of being disturbed?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I do not think so. The number of caribou there is pretty stable at about 800,000 to the best of our estimation. We are of opinion that there are enough caribou there and will be indefinitely to sustain the small native population or that portion which in the future will have to depend upon caribou as their main source of livelihood.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What are the means of protection against the white hunter?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The only people who can take caribou are the natives themselves and the few white hunters who were licenced to hunt in the north in 1937. The only exception to that is the white people living in the Territories, who are allowed to take up to 5 caribou each, but that does not apply to strangers coming in.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Then naturally you hope that the caribou there will suffice for the Eskimos' purposes?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On a sustained yield basis we think they will.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In the report on page 26 there is mention of the fact that "the white fox catch, on which the majority of the Eskimos depend for a large part of their income, was relatively small in the western Arctic and Baffin island during the past season."

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was in 1953.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There again, are there limitations on other trappers, whether white or Indian, entering the areas in which the Eskimos normally do their trapping?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. The Northwest Territories game ordinance establishes strict quotas and seasons when animals can be taken, and the right to take furbearing animals for the sale of fur is limited to natives, Eskimos and Indians, and white hunters who held licences in 1937.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are there registered traplines in operation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Only in the Mackenzie delta area.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Mackenzie district.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Has there been a recent improvement in the number of white fox?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: That is a cyclical problem. The number taken is a factor of the cycle of abundance and scarcity and the price. The cycle is 4 to 5 years.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The scarcity of two years ago was due to the operation of that cycle and not to the action of white hunters or unauthorized hunters?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: We have never suffered any economic losses in furbearing animals through the depredations of white hunters. They are not allowed to take furbearing animals unless they have licences.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have one more question and then I will be through on this part. Eskimo children, I take it, are attending day schools. What is the accommodation?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of the Eskimos in the eastern Arctic there are very few who can attend schools. The only day schools we have in the eastern Arctic are at Chesterfield Inlet, where there is a Roman Catholic hostel, a day school at Port Harrison, and also one at Fort Chimo. There are also missions where some education is given to an additional 400 Eskimos. Mr. Jacobson is in charge of the educational section of the northland administration division.

Mr. J. V. JACOBSON (*Education and Welfare Officer*): There are federal day schools located at Chesterfield Inlet, Cape Dorset, Fort Chimo, Port Harrison, Southampton Island; and in addition there are about 27 mission day schools operated on a part time basis.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Then any educational work that is done among the Eskimos is on the day school basis. What about these hostels?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are two residential schools at Aklavik, one Catholic and the other Anglican. There is also an Anglican hostel opening up at Coppermine.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Where there are day schools operating that obviously means that they are located near the Eskimo community?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Where there is a greater concentration of Eskimos than is usually found.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The families are there and the children are with their families when school is over?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but the trouble is with the families who go hunting. The children follow their parents for that period and do not attend school. The nomadic character of the population, both Eskimo and Indian, is one of the reasons for the new program I outlined this morning.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The residential schools.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Hostels in conjunction with federal day schools.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The children would occupy those hostels while the family is away?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. Or the children may come from other places.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How far away are the families of the children who are in hostels or residential schools?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Up to 600 miles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The school term is so arranged that the children can be with their parents during part of the year for trapping and fishing.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How many children are in these residential schools?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I gave the figures this morning of the number of Eskimo children attending schools. If my memory serves me right, it is about 15 per cent or 300, and I said that about 400 get irregular schooling in the mission schools.

Mr. CHURCHILL: By what arrangement do they come to those residential schools. Is it entirely voluntary on the part of the parents?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Definitely.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: With some persuasion. In the case of Coppermine hostel, the children are brought by the Anglican authorities. There are about 30 children who will congregate there this week, all drawn from an area of not more than 50 miles from the hostel. They are brought in by their parents by dog team by pre-arrangement with the authorities. In the case of Chesterfield Inlet the problem is different and therefore the solution is different. The purpose of the Chesterfield Inlet hostel is to provide educational facilities for the Eskimos who live roughly from Eskimo Point north to Igloolik on the west shore of Fox Basin, a total distance of about 800 miles. These are brought in by airlift, or by dogteam from the closer areas.

Mr. CHURCHILL: When you speak of it being a voluntary method assisted by persuasion, what type of persuasion do you mean?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The chief responsibility for selecting a student rests with the church authority, because their missionaries are acquainted with the area and can produce the most deserving children. We are still at the stage where we must pick and choose, because we do not have facilities for all the children. The children chosen are those who in the opinion of the church authority in touch with them will benefit most from education. The church makes the recommendation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The education of Indians in this country has been done partly by day school work and partly by residential schools. I appreciate the tremendous difficulties which arise in connection with the Eskimo population, scattered as it is over widely separated communities, but there are some objections to residential schools.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I mentioned them this morning and gave reasons why hostels were preferred. That is what our program is—a program of hostels operated by the churches in conjunction with federal day schools.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am not quite clear as to how the hostel fits in.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The hostel is the place where the children live, and the school is the place where they get the actual instruction.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is equivalent to a residential school.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not because a residential school is under the direction of the religious authorities while the federal day schools are under the direction of my department.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Who supervises the hostels?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The hostels are supervised by the officials of the department, but the care of the children and the administration and maintenance of the hostels will be given to the church authorities, Anglican and Catholic, the division between the two being what I mentioned this morning.

Mr. CHURCHILL: My point is that to effect this educational process the children have to be separated from their parents.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For some period of time.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That, as I say, has not worked altogether too well with the Indian population of Canada. I know it is in process at the present time, but has the department carefully considered the weaknesses in such a proposal?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a question of choosing between the system of hostels plus day schools on the one hand—in other words between the present system—and no education at all. I think it is far better that they should have education under the system which we propose. I thought I had made it quite clear this morning that because of the nomadic and semi-nomadic nature of the population it has been impossible to provide education for more than 15 per cent of the Indian children and 30 per cent of the children of the northern territories. We believe that is very bad, and that the only alternative is the one I proposed this morning. There are objections, including the objection which you mentioned, that children have to be separated from their parents, but they are no worse off in that respect than my own children, Mr. Churchill, and that happens because I am a member of parliament, and my children have to go a boarding school. It is exactly the same situation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: But that is not the normal thing for the great bulk of the children of Canada. There is this separation in the case of private schools, but I would say that 90 per cent of the children remain at home during the period of their education, and are not affected by that system.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What is your solution then, Mr. Churchill? Let us have your ideas.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What are you educating these children for?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Why are you educating your children?

Mr. CHURCHILL: These are the children of hunters.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are Canadian citizens, and they are entitled to basic education in the same way as any other Canadian citizens. Surely you would not make a public statement saying that Canadian citizens should not get basic education?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have the greatest objection to the distortion of statements, and that was a pure piece of distortion. I did not say they did not need education. I said "What are you educating them for?"

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: To prepare them for life exactly like your own children.

Mr. CHURCHILL: They live in civilization.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is in preparation for their own life. They benefit because of the basic training we give them in their own schools. They get some idea of sanitation, for instance, and health principles which will prevent the spreading of disease which up to now has been the cause of a reduction in the Indian and Eskimo populations. We are acting because these people are human beings. Secondly we are acting because they are Canadians and because we are sure that we can improve their living conditions. by giving them a basic amount of education, which they will get by means of a special curriculum prepared for them.

Mr. CHURCHILL: These are not unworthy objectives at all, but I submit it is an entirely different thing to educate Canadian children for life in cities and urban areas than to educate Eskimo children whose parents are hunters and who, after their training may go back to hunting.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They will go back. That is why the curriculum is different from the usual curriculum.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the curriculum?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Will you explain that, Mr. Jacobson.

Mr. J. V. JACOBSON: Our curriculum is divided into three parts. We have, first of all, the general all-purpose curriculum which will be primarily designed for those children who are returning to their native way of life. They will get some of the fundamentals of education, such as the three R's, and also they will learn certain skills which will be useful to them when they return to their native way of life. The second type is the academic curriculum for those who will be going on to a higher education in high schools, and universities, and the third will be a vocational curriculum which will teach the children certain skills which they can use in hunting and living under the white man's influence.

Mr. HELLYER: Will these courses prepare them to appreciate the C.B.C. commentaries when they get this new radio station?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I would like to make a short general statement to put the question of facilities and curriculum in proper prospective for the committee. The department feels that the best way to give an education to anybody—Eskimos or otherwise—is through day schools, and therefore wherever there is a sufficient aggregation of Eskimos to warrant a day school being set up, we have one. There are few such places. To take up the slack we have two alternative methods. One is the hostel plus day school, the other is the itinerant teacher. We recognize the difficulty in connection with residential schools, namely that the tendency has been in the past for a child to be taken from his parents and kept away from home for, it may be, a matter of years, so that he goes back unfitted to earn his living by hunting. Therefore we have adjusted the school term in our hostels so that it does not interfere with the child learning the skills which he will need when he goes back to earn his living as a hunter. He is left at home for three or four months of the year so he can go hutning at the best seasons for different types of animals and learn how to take them.

While at school he is not taught geometry, algebra or English literature. He is taught those things which will be of practical benefit to him. One example of this is that he is taught the proper use of a rifle, how to care for it and how to aim it. Much game has been wasted by the Eskimos because, incredible as this may sound, when they see a herd of 20 caribou they do not pick out a caribou and aim at the heart below the shoulder; they simply shoot at the herd, and they have in the past wounded a lot of animals on this account. So we show them how to take care of a gun and instruct them in marksmanship. We also teach them the elements of reading and writing. They will have dealings with the traders and must know how to add sums. They must know how to read in order to benefit from the printed material we make available for them, both in English and in the Eskimo language. For example our Book of Wisdom for the Eskimo contains lessons in how to care for and maintain gasoline engines. Large numbers of Eskimos have come to rely on the outboard engine instead of hand powered kayaks, but unless we tell them they do not realize that they must put oil into the engine. The boys also get instruction in subjects such as the preparation of pelts. The girls are trained in home economics so that they may prepare clean and wholesome food, and keep their houses, and the premises around their houses, clean.

Those are the sort of skills which we are teaching the Eskimos. We think that by carefully "vetting" the courses so that they are useful and seeing that the primitive student is left at home for a sufficient number of months

each year to learn the skills which only his father can teach him, we are overcoming the basic disadvantages of the residential school system.

As for the other means of education which I mentioned, the itinerate teacher, we utilize this service in areas where there is not a sufficient aggregation of people to justify a day school, and where the distance is too great to make it economic to send a child to a hostel. In such areas we have begun the system—as in the southwestern Baffin island—of having a teacher at a central point who goes out periodically visiting villages for, maybe, 100 miles around and giving instruction to the children in the homes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does the Eskimo take more keenly to education than some of our Indian tribes?

Mr. J. V. JACOBSON: The Eskimo is quite adaptable to education, and from my own experience in trying out elements of the intelligence test—I cannot use the complete test because there is no test which has been devised particularly to suit the Eskimos—I find that they are very bright, and after they have overcome the language handicap they progress very rapidly.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: May I ask the minister a question: have the day schools along the Mackenzie river proved a success?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: One of the reasons why we have come to the policy of building hostels is that the day schools have not proved the success that was hoped for when they were established.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: That was my understanding when I made a trip along the river. They did not seem to be a success.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Because of the distances and the fact that the children must follow their parents.

Mr. SIMMONS: The families are away most of the time and it makes no difference in that respect, that is, to the time during which they will be away from their parents, whether you have these hostels, or the old day schools. Is that right?

Mr. JACOBSON: In the past, though, the residential schools might keep a child for four, five or six years at a time.

Mr. SIMMONS: I know that in the case of the Indian school at Car Cross the children all go home during the holidays in the summer.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Indian schools do not get pupil allowances for at least two months of the year, and consequently they send the children to their parents.

Mr. HARDIE: Mr. Cunningham, and some of the others who know that region will bear me out in this, that in the northland, in summer, when the residential schools close, and the pupils are taken home by the mission boats, there is an altogether different feeling in the community when these bright young children come home in clean clothes and with happy, smiling faces after eight months in school, than in places where there are no schools, and the children have no opportunity to go to school. Mr. Churchill has questioned the department on the curriculum and the benefit of an education. If I understood the minister right this morning I think he said in answer to one of Mr. Churchill's questions that wherever possible they intend to keep the native Eskimo in his own element, that is hunting and trapping.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, if he has not been touched or stained by our civilization.

Mr. HARDIE: But of course our civilization is moving in there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said that, too.

Mr. HARDIE: The Eskimo is no different from anyone else, or no different from our forefathers who roamed around northern Europe some years back. They look up to the white man and his gadgets—the rifle, radio, aeroplane and other things—and my feeling is that if we can bring out some of these people and show them what we have here—our living conditions, our education facilities and all the rest, they would not want to go back into their tents in the summer time in the Arctic wastes hunting for caribou when you can fly over for 100 miles on either side and see nothing. You come back to your camp and see these little children there black from eating blueberries, there are, maybe, three or four squirrels in the pot and that is their food.

As far as preserving caribou is concerned, I feel that the increase in the population among the natives is going to decrease the number of caribou. It is a well known fact that when civilization moves into a country wild life diminishes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is true.

Mr. HARDIE: What we should be doing is taking action about these children who are brought out here to go to school. A lot of them are orphans. For instance, I know of children who have spent three of four years in Hamilton, Ontario, being cured of tuberculosis, only to be sent back afterwards to tents or igloos in which people are living on top of one another. This is just sentencing them to death. I feel the department could see that when a child is brought out here to hospital and cured of his disease he should be let out for adoption into a white home where he will have a chance to get an education and all the other advantages which are available to them. Perhaps the minister does not think much of that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not saying I do not think much of it, but I have heard some people in authority who would vigorously disagree with your point of view on that problem.

Mr. HARDIE: I also thought they would.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have seen several cases of orphans—where a child has attended at one of these sanatoriums; when he goes back he cannot fall in with the Indian way of life again, and the Indians themselves do not want him. He is an outcast.

Mr. HARDIE: Who would want to go back to that life after seeing something else? Do you not think that it is our duty to show them our civilization and where possible bring them out to live in our civilization.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But we cannot bring them all south.

Mr. HARDIE: I did not say that. There are for instance, the orphan children. We could start with them, the children who come out here as orphans with tuberculosis and who go into our hospitals. The development in the north depends on the mining communities, and the development of roads will open up the mineral and oil resources if the department of government uses some vision and builds these roads like they did the railroad across Canada when there were 10,000 people in British Columbia. The same thing can be done in the north if they will open up this mining section and move these people to be trained in vocational training and give them employment. There is no use in the department training these people to be mechanics or tractor operators if they have not jobs to put them in once they are educated.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As I said this morning, we are going to follow parallel lines of progress: one, for economic development and two to meet the human problem. As Mr. Harkness said, the two problems have a lot in common. Progress in one field has to accompany progress in the other. As I said this morning, what I have in mind is that we will have a more aggressive policy for road building. We are already making a start on it, and of course if we

are going to have more road building that will give more employment to the natives. That is what we want to do. I do not disagree with you. I also agree wholeheartedly that that is exactly the line of policy we should take and it is the line of policy we will follow.

Mr. HARDIE: I think you will admit after your trip in the north and after walking into one of those Eskimo tents and seeing what you saw in one of these tents that the sooner we get these people out of those tents and into our civilization the better off we and they are going to be.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not agree with you altogether. Some of those tents were not so bad. Take for instance at McPherson we visited a few homes. Do you not agree the ones we visited were clean?

Mr. HARDIE: Sure. The biggest part of those people were half-breed people who had been to the Anglican mission school at Hay river 20 years ago and educated there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will agree that education at least has a good effect.

Mr. HARDIE: Definitely.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It had a good effect at Fort McPherson. We were in the same houses together.

Mr. HARDIE: They were picked by the department as the best.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, no. They were really good, Mr. Hardie. Somebody said it looked as if everything was spic and span because I was there, but I also went into houses which I picked myself.

Mr. HARDIE: What about that tent at the White Whale station?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: After all I got in the tent and I saw the Eskimo woman and her children, and I did not think it was so bad.

Mr. HARDIE: Would you like to go back to that if you had been brought up there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I was not brought up in that kind of a life.

Mr. HARDIE: Of necessity they have to live like that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, I do not agree. They can be cleaner with education.

Mr. HARDIE: They can be cleaner—well, in the case of the family who are out caribou hunting you will find caribou guts around the tent and the dogs there, and you will have 12 people living in one tent, the wife has to park herself in one room with 12 kids and try to keep it clean.

Mr. SIMMONS: I think a lot of them are satisfied there who would not be satisfied on the outside. However, I do say give the younger ones a chance, yes.

Mr. HARDIE: Any Eskimo will tell you that he thinks his child ought to have the benefit of travelling and seeing our civilization.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a big jamboree for scouts at Niagara Falls this summer, and we are paying the expenses through the Boy Scouts Association of a number of Eskimo and Indian Boy Scouts, to come down and visit Canada below the 60th parallel.

Mr. HARDIE: For a couple of days.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to me that the eventual end of the policy which Mr. Hardie proposes would be the entire depopulation of the north and the inevitable result in the end would be that we would have no fixed population left in the far north and therefore our right to retain that territory would come into question.

Mr. HARDIE: By that time civilization will have moved there. In the meantime let us do something about those who live there.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I was very interested in Mr. Simmons' remarks this morning and particularly his radio problem. I do not want Mr. Simmons and others to think that they are particularly behind the times with respect to radio service. Until the very last few years in communities over a stretch of 1,000 miles between North Bay and Winnipeg there had been no Canadian radio facilities provided. Now, those communities all had several hundreds of people there and they were on the railroad where the network is available and all that was required was a small capital expenditure to extend facilities into that part but the C.B.C. simply did not have funds available until fairly recently to bring those communities into the national radio system even though the individual cost would be about $10,000. I think about 15 stations in the last two years have been established there. But, you can see the relative cost of that to the million dollars spoken of today. I do not want Mr. Simmons to feel he is away behind the rest of the country because all that country until recently was in that position too.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Those people were on the C.P.R. and C.N.R. lines and at least had newspapers. They have no news of Canada up in the Yukon.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I just did not want Mr. Simmons to feel that he was so very far behind some other northern sections.

Mr. SIMMONS: We do feel we are away behind. For instance, for the radio entertainment we do receive, we have got to look to the American stations for it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The trouble is, as I discovered when I was in Whitehorse this summer, and even in Yellowknife, you have the definite impression that you are not in Canada; you do not get Canadian news except after many days and you do not know what is currently going on except sometimes through the American stations.

Mr. SIMMONS: In some of the outlying districts the only thing which keeps a man from going nuts is listening to the radio, in the hills where those miners and trappers are.

The CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps some of you gentlemen should make representations at the broadcasting committee.

Mr. SIMMONS: This is a good place because the minister will quote me.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am only one voice.

The CHAIRMAN: It would not do any harm if you made your representations also to Mr. Dunton.

Mr. SIMMONS: He is very sympathetic to our requirements in the way of radio. I think Mr. Robertson has had a talk with him and found him sympathetic also, but the matter seems to be the money.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The cost.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: This morning the minister spoke about the disastrous decline in fur prices, of muskrat, in the Aklavik area and the serious effect of that on the ability of the people to make their living. How many of the population in the Aklavik area are dependent on fur trapping?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Do you wish to know with respect to the Aklavik area or the whole MacKenzie?

Mr. HARKNESS: The Aklavik area.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: About 90 per cent of the natives.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many are dependent on the reindeer?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: About 22 to 24 families.

Mr. HARKNESS: Since the drop in fur prices and the difficulty in making a living that way have you had any considerable increase in the liking on the part of the Eskimos for the reindeer?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Some. It has been a good deal easier to hire herders.

Mr. HARKNESS: You have not had a sufficient increase then to establish more herds?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have established one this year.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It is easier to get them to come in as herders. We have 18 people hired now as herders, mostly Eskimos. 3 years ago we were having trouble keeping herders.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: How are they remunerated?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: As civil servants they are paid in cash.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many would be in this Aklavik area 90 per cent of whom depend on furs?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: 1,000 to 1,200.

Mr. HARKNESS: There would be 1,100 or more dependent on the fur business?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Both Eskimos and Indians.

Mr. HARKNESS: When the supply of food went bad and the catch was also bad and the people had been to a large extent on relief, that relief was provided entirely by the department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, and also by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, through the Indian affairs branch.

Mr. HARKNESS: The Department of Citizenship and Immigration looks after the relief of the Indians?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: And you look after the relief of the Eskimos?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: What form does that relief take?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Orders on the traders for goods on an approved ration list.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many of those 1,200 have been on relief the past year?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I cannot give you an accurate answer to that. I could get the figures for you.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do you have an approximate idea?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I would say that at least 85 per cent of the people who live in the Delta have had some relief during the past two years and about 25 per cent have had practically total relief during the past two years.

Mr. HARKNESS: And that could well continue as long as fur prices are poor I presume?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: No. We taking remedial measures. For the past two years we have been providing construction projects such as roads and we have hired local people. In the coming summer we expect to cut the relief very considerably by hiring approximately 50 heads of families who will work for us for four months on useful labour. If we hire 50 that should take 200 off relief for the full year. In 1955-56 we think relief will be not one third of what it was in 1953-54.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what you might call a partial solution for the next two years?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you any long term solution or proposed solution to this problem?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: There are a considerable number of measures each of which will help. There will be an increase in the number of registered traplines as there is still an area available for people to take up trapping. Another measure is interesting them in new occupations. We are training skilled and semi-skilled persons, carpenters, tractor operators, diesel men, and so on in increasing numbers. We have approximately 25 to 30 in training this winter at Aklavik for that purpose.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there going to be any employment for them after they are trained after the 3 year period when the town is built and the Dew line is being moved?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. We are not trying to train more than we are confident will be able to obtain permanent employment.

Mr. HARKNESS: What would be the projects they would be employed on?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Employment on installations in the Delta area. The new Aklavik will be 2 or 3 times as big as the old Aklavik, and there will be a very substantial number employed there and on the maintenance of the Dew line. We confidently hope skilled and semi-skilled people will be absorbed in increasing numbers on the maintenance of the stations. We are also carrying on research in whale hunting in the Beaufort Sea, which was once a scene of large whaling activity. The whales were depleted and therefore the industry fell off to nothing, but now there are signs that the whale population is coming back and we are interesting a number of Eskimos in the taking of large bowhead whale. One whale will be enough to ensure a living for one year for 10 families.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is one reason why we are training Eskimos also in boat building.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am trying to get at what solution there will be for this. There is really quite a serious situation which has been there during the past year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. It has given us great concern.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is just a partial solution by moving the town. You have to look beyond that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: These are just examples of a multitude of projects. In the northeastern Yukon there are good indications that in a few years there will be substantial amounts of oil as well as metals taken from the ground. There might be justification, if that happened, to provide for the construction of a road through that area and on to the Delta, which would mean there would be avenues of employment open for the Delta people, and we would hope to place some of them in industry there. Another possibility is agriculture. While the agricultural possibilities in the north are practically untapped as yet we know there is a substantial quantity of agricultural land available from Fort Liard down the river to its junction with the Mackenzie at Fort Simpson. We are considering a scheme of small scale vocational training in agriculture at Fort Simpson. The Department of Agriculture will make a survey of the soil in the area of the Territories, and I hope we may be able to show some of the Indians and Eskimos that farming, lumbering and fishing are all good ways of life.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am very glad to hear of these developments particularly. It does hold more hope than anything else I have heard as far as the future of these people is concerned. I presume that nearly all of these 1,200 live in or close to Aklavik?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: They live in the Delta area. Aklavik is only a place where they come to trade. The Delta territory is 50 miles wide and 100 miles long, which is 5,000 square miles. All that is muskrat land and the people are dispersed through it. The population in Aklavik goes as low as 300 and in the peak season as high as 1,200.

Mr. HARKNESS: In connection with this general matter of relief, what is the form in which relief is given throughout the Northwest Territories to both the Indian and the Eskimo?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In a few cases we issue family allowances in cash.

Mr. HARKNESS: But all Indian family allowances are issued in cash?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: And in the Delta area some of the Eskimos get cash as well?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is only in the eastern Arctic that family allowances are issued in kind.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Relief is issued in kind to them. Some of the Eskimos in the eastern Arctic do not have any idea as to the value of money. They would not make any differentiation between a $10 bill and a $1 bill.

Mr. GARLAND: I wonder whether some of the officials could enlighten me on this matter. I noticed that some weeks ago there was considerable publicity given to a couple of Eskimo boys who were in Toronto. I presume they were from this school at Aklavik. They were brought there to study, I believe, the fundamentals of some particular piece of equipment—a bulldozer or something of that sort—which would be used to handle the coming move, and it struck me that they were bright boys. They spoke reasonably good English, they were of good appearance, and I was wondering from what type of environment they came. Would they be the product of urban settlement at Aklavik or would they be hunters?

Mr. F. FRASER (*Chief, Territorial Division*): One of them is the holder of a registered trap line, and his occupation is trapping for a livelihood. The other one earns his livelihood in various ways, but they are both typical of the type of Eskimo who has been educated. Most of them speak as good English as I do, or any other Canadian.

Mr. GARLAND: When this period of employment is finished, will they revert to their original trapping?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It is very likely that they will be permanently absorbed in the white economy.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 312?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 314.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not think we should carry this section because a lot of questions are mixed up between one section and another, and I think it is better to follow through our discussion and then perhaps carry the whole lot.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Even if a section were passed I would not object to answering a question.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I think we should follow the practice of the committee of supply as closely as we can and have a broad discussion, but when we change from one section to another we should try to carry some items because some members cannot attend all the meetings, and they like to feel that they can watch a timetable with respect to these items.

Mr. HARKNESS: There are some general questions in connection with roads.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We shall come to those votes. There is construction in the Northwest Territories and there is construction in the Yukon. It would be much easier for me that way because I have a list of all the work, either on construction or maintenance, available when we get to the votes. There are so many details. Take for instance the construction of roads and buildings, works, land, and purchase of new equipment in the Northwest Territories. That is item 316, and the same thing for the Yukon is 320.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, I will leave item 314 to the last and call item 315 now. Operation and maintenance. Details on page 421.

Mr. HARDIE: That is for the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, it is operation and maintenance in the Northwest Territories, item 315. This vote provides for the operating costs of educating Indians and Eskimos and for money spent on Eskimo relief and welfare including the Reindeer range, maintaining truck roads and federal buildings in the Northwest Territories and administering territorial ordinances. We have dealt with the education of Indians and Eskimos and with Eskimo relief and welfare and also with the Reindeer station.

Mr. SIMMONS: Where has that increase developed? In the roads?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is not construction, this is maintenance. The bulk of the increases is accounted for first in the total salaries, the increase in the number of teachers including the taking over of the Indian teachers. Another large increase is in payments for the maintenance of children and of aged and infirm in educational and other institutions. Again, there is the taking over of the education of Indians in the Northwest Territories. Fuel for heating departmental building also shows a large increase for the same reason, namely because we are taking over the Indian schools. Part of the increase in materials and supplies is also for that reason.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is under "Other materials and supplies".

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Materials and supplies, yes. "Other materials and supplies". I will give an explanation of the increase. There is $9,000 for the new vocational training centre at Fort Chimo, $12,000 for the new vocational training centre at Frobisher Bay.

Mr. HARDIE: About these schools which you are taking over from the Department of Indian Affairs this year. As I understand the minister's original statement, schools will be built in Aklavik, Fort Smith and Fort Simpson.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you mind repeating the question?

Mr. HARDIE: According to your statement this morning, schools will be built in future at Fort McPherson, Aklavik, Fort Simpson and Fort Smith.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They will be enlarged. We are building new hostels and enlarging the present day school facilities.

Mr. HARDIE: These facilities will house students in localities where today we have Indian day schools?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Or no schools at all.

Mr. HARDIE: What will happen, say, to the school at Rocher River.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It will continue to operate for the people who live there. There are people living there and in all the area around. There is quite a community at Rocher River.

Mr. HARDIE: Mr. Simmons asked a while ago about the results of the day school at Rocher River. We found that five or six children attend that school regularly, and I thought the idea was to take those children from such centres, say, to Fort Smith.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not know what the exact figures are for Rocher River. The hostels being built at such centres as Fort Smith, for instance, will take many of the children who could not attend a day school, at Rocher River for example, because their parents were away on hunting trips.

Mr. HARDIE: But the day schools will continue to operate?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For those who stay there all the year round, yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice an amount recoverable from the government of the Northwest Territories for the education of children other than Indians and Eskimos—$144,000. What would be the charge per pupil?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: $345.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is paid by the Northwest Territories council.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: By the Northwest Territories administration.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any charge or tax on the white people there?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: In the Northwest Territories there are organized school districts only in Yellowknife, where there is a public school district and a separate school district, and they pay local taxes for the support of their schools in much the same way as a school district in a province. Elsewhere in the Territory no resident pays directly any portion of the cost of schooling his children. Responsibility is borne by the territorial government out of territorial revenue.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Out of the liquor profits mostly.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is a lucrative source?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are two lucrative sources—the tax rental agreement with the federal government and the liquor profits.

Mr. HARKNESS: That brings me to the question which I want to ask. What revenue is drawn out of the Northwest Territories on the one hand and out of the Yukon on the other in the way of taxes, liquor profits and so forth.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Liquor profits go to the territorial administration, not to the federal government. As to the amount of income tax—personal and corporate income tax you mean?

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes. That would be the big item, I think.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have the figures somewhere. I could get them for you by morning.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes. I wanted to get some idea of how much revenue was going out in comparison with the amount coming in. In other words I wanted to know to what extent this is an asset, or to what extent it may be a liability and, if it is a liability, what ideas you have in mind in order to change the picture.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: I have not got the figures here at this time, but there are two divisions of revenue which may be considered; one, the revenues paid to the territorial administration and the other the revenues paid to the federal government. As far as the federal revenues are concerned, they are very much less than the federal payments which go into the two territories. In other words there is a very substantial transfer payment made into the Territories, which is exactly the situation which would be expected at this stage of development. An attempt was made last year to break down as accurately as we could all the figures we had available to see what the financial situation looked like. While I could not give the committee any figures at the moment, I recall that the payments to the two territories at the present time are several times as high as the payments from them. This is precisely what we expected would be the picture, because we are, nationally, in the stage of investing in the northern territories and not of deriving income from them. We can get the figures for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Is item 315 carried?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We can discuss the figures when we come to deal with the financial agreement.

Mr. HARKNESS: What financial agreement are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The financial agreement made by the federal government with the Northwest Territories administration on the one hand, and with the Yukon administration on the other.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is no item for that here.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a statutory item: the tax rental agreements with the territories. We have agreements with them on much the same basis as those we have with nine of the ten provinces.

Mr. SIMMONS: Are the agreements with the Yukon and Northwest Territories similar to those other agreements?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, they are.

The CHAIRMAN: That is on the next page.

Mr. HARDIE: Do the administration of northern affairs budget for the operation of Wood Buffalo park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: Is not Wood Buffalo park a national park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, it is.

Mr. HARDIE: Would it be possible to budget for Wood Buffalo park under national parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Wood Buffalo park is a special park. It is really an animal reserve. The meat which we get from the buffalo slaughter in the park is sent partly to the Northwest Territories and partly to The South.

Mr. HARDIE: Can the minister give the committee some idea of how this buffalo slaughter is worked out—the amount of revenue derived from the sale of the buffalo meat as against the cost of slaughtering the buffalo?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: This is the fourth year of the operation. In the first and second years the capital expenditure for the establishment of an abattoir and ancillary buildings very much exceeded revenue, but by the end of the fourth year of operation the proceeds from the sale of meat will have met all the costs of capital expenditure to date. Part of the meat is sold for distribution in the territories. Some goes to missions which use it in hospitals and residential schools. The price to missions is 15 cents. It is also sold to the Hudson Bay Company at a price which is intended to make it reasonably competitive with beef. There would be criticism if the beef producers were put entirely out of business by the government. The price to the Hudson's Bay Company this year was 35 cents to which they add 20 cents per pound. That meat is packed in 90-pound lots. The meat that was sold outside was on a different basis. Owing to the time of slaughter, it has to be flown out by air at high cost. As the slaughter was in excess of possible sales in the north, an amount was disposed of to outside packers at five cents a pound f.o.b. Fort Smith for dressed carcasses.

Mr. HARDIE: And this year you feel that the cost of sale will be fairly well covered by the revenue?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The receipts will have equalled expenses by the end of the current year.

Mr. HARDIE: Can we presume that in another year the cost of buffalo meat to the natives of the country will be a lot cheaper than 55 cents?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It is possible that it can be. The price is not necessarily a matter of economics, it is a matter of policy from various angles.

Mr. HARDIE: I see. 15 cents to the missions and 5 cents to the Canada Packers and Burns. That is on the carcass of course. 35 cents to the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Hudson's Bay Company sells for 55 cents per pound which is a 20-cent markup.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (Deputy Minister): I may say that the whole question of the operation of the meat business in Wood Buffalo park is being examined at the present time. This is quite a complicated matter. On the one hand the rate of increase of buffalo in the park is exceeding the annual slaughter and has been doing so for quite some time, and the point has been reached where the grazing acreage of the park is not equal to the number of animals there. They have been spreading beyond the boundary of the park. Our general policy, we think, ought to be to kill off approximately the natural increase in order to keep the numbers in the herd down to the grazing level. This raises the question of the price at which the meat ought to be sold, and that is a comparatively difficult problem when one considers that at the other end of the Mackenzie you have the reindeer herds. If the price of buffalo meat is fixed too low, there will be protests from those who have the reindeer herds. Then, at the other end, in the south, we have a problem with the beef producers in connection with the sale of buffalo meat in the general markets.

Mr. HARKNESS: Why would you want to prevent these buffalo spreading outside the park. I would think that it would be an excellent way of providing a means of subsistence to the Indians.

Mr. ROBERTSON: The incidence of tuberculosis is extremely high. We do not know what it is exactly, but it is apparently upwards of 40 per cent, and we are a little concerned at their spreading too much until the tuberculosis rate can be cut down by a controlled slaughter program. The province of Alberta is also concerned.

Mr. HARKNESS How many have been slaughtered a year?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: We started with 450 for each of the first two years and then it was increased to about 700.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the total population estimated to be?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: 13,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We thought it was about 12,000 but we had information that it might be as high as 20,000. I do not know. Here we were given a figure of 12,000, and when we were in the north we were given a figure of approximately 20,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: Could this buffalo project not probably hold the possibility of supplying the meat requirements of the MacKenzie river valley Indians and white population also?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. As a matter of fact, when I was at Fort Smith I had nothing but buffalo and in Aklavik nothing but reindeer.

Mr. HARKNESS: Buffalo is in my opinion as good as beef.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Unless you happen to get an old bull. I would think that this buffalo as far as the southern part of the Arctic is concerned is perhaps the answer to the Indian food supply.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: We are providing the population with buffalo in the form of relief. For instance, if we have knowledge that a group of Eskimos have missed the caribou migration we send a plane with buffalo meat which is dropped to them.

Mr. HARKNESS: How far east and how far west of the park could these buffalo roam?

Mr. F. FRASER (Chief of the Territorial Division): They go east approximately 75 miles. We do not know how far west they go because they go into the more or less uninhabitated parts of Alberta south of Vermillion. That is well into Alberta.

Mr. HARKNESS: Could they go as far as the position of the reindeer?

Mr. FRASER: Not any further east, because they must have open meadows, but west they could go as far as the farmlands in Alberta. They have got to have open meadows in the winter time.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you any plan to eradicate the tuberculosis among them?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes, a program is being worked out with the Department of Agriculture at the present time. We plan to construct two new slaughtering establishments in Wood Buffalo Park which will handle a selected kill to be made each year, with testing before the kill and selecting and killing the animals which have tuberculosis. Certain of the animals showing signs of tuberculosis can still be used after slaughtering with complete safety. All the meat is closely inspected. Those which can be used will be used for meat purposes. According to the program which has been indicated, at the end of about 12 years of selected slaughtering the tuberculosis rate would be reduced from 40 per cent to about 2 per cent.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am very heartened by the general picture as far as these buffalo are concerned. I would hope that after the tuberculosis is eliminated they would be allowed to spread as far as they can spread.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 315 is carried. We are now on item 316, "Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment".

Mr. HARKNESS: In this I see there is construction of roads and bridges $421,200. What roads are you proposing to build this year for that sum in the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are mainly bridges this year. We have to construct a bridge at Hay river across the west channel at a cost of $300,000, and over the Salt River to provide access to Wood Buffalo Park, to replace a bridge destroyed by ice in 1954, at a cost of $120,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: So there is no road construction in this country?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No road construction for the Northwest Territories this year. The road construction which will be done will be done by an oil company from the Mackenzie Highway near Hay river towards Mills lake.

Mr. HARKNESS: I must say that in this particular regard the department is falling down because if we are ever to get roads into these mineralized areas I think the department has to plan on building a certain number of miles every year, and the fact that there are no roads being built this year at all is a serious matter.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is this road which is going to be built, and also a resource road being built in the Marian river area. The amount of our participation in the building of that road will be in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. HARKNESS: How long a road is that?

Mr. FRASER: A very short winter bush road to get exploratory mining equipment in. It will be about 40 miles in length at a cost of about $12,000 and the department will put up $6,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is a matter mainly of taking out bush?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Not really building a road at all?

Mr. FRASER: No.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: When we are at the prospecting stage in an area which is wild, the company feels and we feel it is better to provide the kind of road which will serve the purpose without making expenditures for an all weather highway when it is not necessary.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not really feel that that is the situation. I think what you have got to do—if you are ever going to get that country and that mineralized area opened up—is to build a certain number of miles of road every year on fairly definite planning. It seems to me that that is the sort of policy you should be following. The mineralized area Mr. Hardie spoke of is north of the lake and I would think that this year you should be putting in 20, 30, 40 or 50 miles in that district so that you will eventually at least have a means of getting into that area. From this you could build these resource roads either from the end of it, or connecting into it, because at the present time this road ends at Hay river and you are out of luck when you reach the end of it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said that we were planning to discuss our road policy with the Department of Finance, and I felt that with such an answer the members of the committee would understand.

Mr. HARKNESS: I had hoped to hear that you had definite plans that you were trying to sell to the Department of Finance?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We certainly have, but I do not believe I am at liberty to give you the plan which I am going to try to sell. I will be at liberty to give you the plan when it is sold.

Mr. HARDIE: Could the minister tell me how much he has spent on what we would call resource roads say in the last 6 or 7 years?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not have the figures here.

Mr. HARDIE: Estimates and public accounts over a few years show that the construction of roads and bridges amounts to the same figure as this year, $400,000. This year it is all bridges. A year ago they did $25,000 worth of work on a road between Alexandra Falls and Pine Point.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are going to spend a small amount of money to improve the access to Alexandra Falls. After my visit there I asked that a certain amount be included in the estimates to provide for easier access. You will remember, Mr. Hardie, you were with me.

Mr. HARDIE: I feel much like Mr. Harkness that the department should come out with a policy of building roads and let us take it over a ten year period, we are going to build so much road each year and spend so much money.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It depends very much—and you will agree with this—where the mineral discoveries are to be made or are made.

Mr. HARDIE: Well, the mineral discoveries were in the first instance north of Great Slave lake. It does not take much time to look at a geological map. You go back to 1944 when the country was prospected and all the way through that area from Yellowknife over to Reliance there are deposits of gold and copper base metals, and at Mud lake there is a proven body of $55 million worth of ore. I believe that the only thing holding that back is that we do not have enough vision to put in the roads. If we did we would get people to invest money in that area and in that way open it up.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is exactly what we are discussing at the present time.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think our chief complaint is that there has been a discussion on this for years and still it is held up.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Are you not satisfied with the examples which we have given of the difficult problems that we have to cope with in the north? All these have to be studied very seriously. You have had quite a few examples of the tremendous problems that we have to cope with. There are only 24 hours in the day, and I and my officials are working every night and every weekend in order to try to bring forward a policy which will develop the north. Rome was not built in one day. At the pace we are going now the north is going to be developed much quicker than Rome was built, but you cannot revise policies overnight. There are so many discussions in which we have to engage and to which we have to give our attention. I would be very glad myself if I could have come here and said, here we are with our new policy for road building. While we are putting forward and studying the new kind of policy which we think we should have the government agree to, we have to prepare a new education program. You can imagine what an education program like the one I proposed this morning meant to my officials, and not only to my officials but to myself, in time discussing it with all the interested parties, discussing it for hours and hours and hours with religious authorities of two religions. There were long, protracted discussions before it could be put forward. In every field of activity in the north it is the same thing. It is only after careful study and long discussion that you can get ahead. For instance, I have been discussing with Mr. Hardie, with my officials, and with a number of interested parties, the rates for transportation in the north. It has taken a few months to get the Canadian Pacific Airlines to come before the Air Transport Board with a proposal for a reduction in rates. Everything is like that. We are pushing ahead as fast as we can. I cannot go any faster because if I go any faster I will go too fast to the hospital.

Mr. HARKNESS: I will just say in the whole 75 years—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not talking of 75 years, but in the last year. I was not born 75 years ago.

Mr. HARKNESSS —the only road building project in all that time to open up the Northwest Territories has been the Grimshaw road and it has been built as far as Hay river, and unless that road is extended then money put into that road is lost in my opinion.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In 1882 it took three months to go from Fort Simpson to Winnipeg. I did it last summer in a few hours.

Mr. HARKNESS: You did it by plane, of course.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Over a long distance—

Mr. HARKNESS: The provision of aeroplane services are very important, still they do not solve the basic transportation problem of the Northwest Territories, particularly into mineralized areas.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Here you have to be careful that you distinguish between the mineralized area around Great Slave lake and the Mackenzie valley, which extends from Great Slave lake to Aklavik, a distance of 1,200 miles. You have to distinguish also with the eastern Arctic. You cannot have one policy for the whole area. You can have approximately the same policy for the Yukon and the area around Great Slave lake.

Mr. SIMMONS: The mineralized areas are all you would have the same policy for.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what we are talking about. Nobody is proposing a road from Great Slave lake to Hudson bay.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: One of the reasons why the construction of roads has been going ahead more quickly in the Yukon is that there is no water transportation there, while in the Mackenzie district you have water transportation.

Take, for instance, the case of the Eldorado mine at Great Bear lake. I told you last Wednesday that the company uses its own transport in the three summer months down to Fort McMurray, and in these three months gets its supplies and stockpiles them.

The Yukon is not in the same position at all. There, you have to have all-weather roads. The concentrates are shipped by truck to the railhead at Whitehorse. Water transportation is cheaper than road transportation. Even if you build a road from Yellowknife to the Marian river, do not forget that you will have to have transport from Yellowknife to Hay river—or to Fort McMurray—by boat unless you have a road built all around the lake.

Mr. HARDIE: I am speaking of north of Yellowknife. You have to have roads to get the available water transportation. If you do not have roads you cannot get the ore out.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I did not say it should not be done. I said that from Yellowknife to Hay river you would be limited to transportation by water in the summer months, and over a lake which is pretty difficult to navigate.

Mr. SIMMONS: You would have tractor trains in the winter.

Mr. HARDIE: I am putting these things up as suggestions, not as criticisms. I know that you, Mr. Minister, and your department have worked hard on these policies, but I would like to suggest that in thinking of the future development of the northwest we should keep a very well-prepared plan in mind. I would like to know what the minister thinks of this: are we going to have population first, and then transportation, or are we going to have transportation first and population afterwards?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You are going to have transportation there—roads—and these will be what I would call resource roads to open up areas where we know or with regard to which we have definite indications, that an economic mining operation is possible.

Mr. HARDIE: Therefore the sound policy would be to put in roads and the population will follow after.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: Then I hope that possibly not this year, but next year we will do something about a road policy north of the Great Slave lake.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that in my own estimates last year, under the item "Construction of roads and bridges in the Northwest Territories" the amount was $700. This year it is $421,000.

Mr. HARDIE: I know you are getting these things done, but in future years I think the department should have a policy, a definite policy of so many miles of road per year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Is that a good test Mr. Hardie?

Mr. HARDIE: Surely. Take the railroad crossing the prairies. The founders of confederation really had vision when they put the railroad through buffalo country.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not lack vision, I can tell you. I have a good imagination, and if it is at all possible it will certainly be done. We are revising our road policy.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Mr. HARKNESS: No. There are expenditures in connection with the re-location of Aklavik—$200,000 last year and $212,000 this year. How far is that resettlement of Aklavik gone on now.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: What was done last year was really the selection of a site for the new location of Aklavik. A team was sent there in March, 1954. They undertook surveys and drilled at various possible locations, to determine the character of the sub-soil. In August the possibilities were narrowed down to one site on the east side of the Delta, and that was selected. The site was definitely confirmed by the cabinet in the autumn of last year as the new site, and this year the project can go ahead. During last year a good deal of equipment and machinery was acquired which will be available for the work, and some lumber was stockpiled in the new area. The main work this year will be the construction of a wharf, the initial construction on an airstrip at the new site, the location of the main roads, the establishment of a stock-pile of construction equipment, the carrying out of detailed soil investigations, the construction of temporary buildings, the preparation of access roads and the wharf approach.

Mr. SIMMONS: How long is this program of re-location expected to take?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: I can give you a statement outlining what program is contemplated. During the winter of 1955-56 a certain amount of road and airstrip construction; in the summer of 1956 the construction of utilities, hospital and school foundations for residences and further work on the airstrip. In the winter of 1956-57 inside work on the different construction projects, as far as this is possible. In the summer of 1957 the further construction of utilities, hospital, school, and residential buildings and the moving of certain residential buildings. In the winter of 1957-58 further inside work. In the summer of 1958 the program calls for the whole project to be completed.

Mr. HARKNESS: I see. What difference is there between the soil at this new site and at the site you have abandoned.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: There is a substantial difference. At the old site the soil is what the engineers call silt, very much permeated with ice. The proportion of water to solids varies anywhere from equal parts to about two parts of water to one part solid. When covering vegetation is removed, as it has to be removed for road construction, or when buildings are built, the thawing of the ice causes the soil to turn into mush, almost, when it is warm, and when it re-freezes you get a great deal of heaving. Construction on it is extremely difficult. What the survey team was looking for was an area where there was gravel or something much more suitable for building on—something with much less water content—and this has been found at the new site, according to the engineering experts. In their opinion the soil will be suitable. When thawing occurs, the water will drain from the loose soil without a change occurring in the form and mass of the soil. It is such changes that cause difficulty.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is impossible to have an airstrip around the present Aklavik, but a good spot has been found for an airstrip about three miles from the new site.

Mr. HARKNESS: The sole cause for this move is the melting of this soil around Aklavik? In other words the disappearance of the permafrost.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: No, that is not the sole cause. It is an important factor but there are other factors. Aklavik is built on a site which juts out into one of the channels of the river, and behind it there are marshes which reduce the total area which is at all possible for construction purposes to one which is pretty well completely built up now. Expansion of Aklavik simply cannot take place in the present location. It is clear that there must be a substantial expansion of whatever community there is at the end of the Mackenzie river system. It either has to come by establishing a second community, or else by

moving the whole community to a new and expandible site. Consideration must also be given to the fact that an airfield cannot be built at Aklavik. This is more serious than it might seem, because the only present means of surface transportation there is by water; and this means that during six weeks of breakup in spring, and during freezeup in the fall, there is no means whatever of getting into Aklavik. If, for example, an epidemic should break out there, at such times, there is no means of getting in or out.

Mr. HARKNESS: Except by helicopter.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: With a helicopter it could probably be done. But it might be hard to find another airfield close enought to supply it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The nearest airstrip is at Norman Wells.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: The situation is quite impossible for a community of any size.

Mr. HARKNESS: How far is this move?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: 33 air miles.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Two further objections might be mentioned to the present site. One is that the land is very lowlying, subject to flooding and erosion. Erosion goes on steadily. The second factor is that because of the low level, there is no contour and a sewage and water system is almost impossible to install. For an expanding community the situation is one which is simply impossible.

Mr. HARKNESS: This move will take Aklavik away from the Delta and put it on the opposite side of the river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is still on the edge of the Delta.

Mr. HARKNESS: And it is separated by the width of the river itself—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This new Aklavik is on the east channel of the Delta, and right on the east channel. When you are on the new site of Aklavik, if you look west you look at the Delta immediately on the other side of the channel.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: If you mean that the community is moved away from the traplines of some registered trappers, it should be remembered that others are much closer to their lines on the east side of the Delta.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where do the majority of these people live, or secure their living at the present time—west of this channel or east?

Mr. FRASER: Almost entirely west of the new site.

Mr. HARKNESS: The town is separated from these people by the width of the Mackenzie river.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There will probably be a small community at the old Aklavik. But you will not find anywhere in the Delta the same conditions as you have in the new site. Everywhere in the Delta the soil is nothing but an immense sponge.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words this was the only fairly close location which was suitable and which you could find? Is that the situation?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. So much so that we were almost despairing of ever finding anything. But when we visited this new site, my deputy, Mr. Hardie and I, last summer, we felt that it was like finding a new land. We and our experts had examined possible sites on the west channel and the one which in particular we hoped would be good proved not to be so. It was mostly shale and silt. The only possibility was, really, to move to the eastern channel. That is the only place which could be found.

Mr. HARKNESS: The difficulty with that is that it will be shut off for all time from communication with the delta and the area east of the delta except by water.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Aklavik was the same. Aklavik was really only an island. They are islands in the delta. It could not be reached except by water or by plane.

Mr. HARKNESS: Except that the western side of the west channel would have been a much better location.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That would have been one of the advantages if we could have found a suitable place on the west channel, but it just proved impossible to find one.

Mr. HARKNESS: Was there anything around Fort McPherson that would have been satisfactory?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is much too far from the delta, and I am informed that it is also silt.

Mr. SIMMONS: Have you crossed the river? There is good high ground there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, that is what proved not to be good. It is shale.

Mr. ROBERTSON: According to the information we were given by the engineers who had looked into this question the higher ground on the other side, that is the west side along the Richardson mountains—which looked like good firm soil, turned out on investigation to be eroded shale. When it has weathered it turns out to be much the same stuff as silt so far as construction is concerned. Neither it nor the alluvial silt formation is considered suitable for construction.

Mr. HARKNESS: Are all the costs for construction of the new buildings for the people of Aklavik being borne by the dominion government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The costs arising from the moving are, yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Or do these people bear all the costs

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The answer is that we are paying all the costs of the move. Some buildings will not be worth moving, and for them problems of allocation of cost will be worked out.

Item 316 carried.

Mr. HARKNESS: There are several other items here. There is an item respecting the construction or acquisition of buildings and works which is up about three times on last year's figure. Is that the result of the construction of these schools and hospitals?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. The program I outlined this morning was approved by the cabinet last week. So the first amount in connection with this will be in a supplementary estimate.

Mr. HARKNESS: You mean the educational program?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: This has nothing to do with the educational program?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It relates to the construction and acquisition of buildings and works. I could give you a list:

Chesterfield Inlet, N.W.T.		
Addition of two classrooms and improvement of heating system	$	$ 90,000
Churchill, Manitoba		
Alteration of surplus buildings of Department of National Defence to accommodate the Northern Service Officer and 17 Eskimo families, to be reimbursed by monthly rent		15,000

Coral Harbour, N.W.T.		
(*a*) Combination residence, office and storage for Northern Service Officer	40,000	
House for Eskimo assistant	10,000	50,000
Fort Chimo, P.Q.		
(*a*) Combination residence, office and storage for Northern Service Officer	40,000	
(*b*) House for Eskimo assistant	10,000	
(*c*) Alteration of buildings acquired from Department of Transport for vocational training centre	6,000	56,000
Fort McPherson, N.W.T.		
Removing oil storage tank and clearing storage area for oil barrels—Indian Day School site		1,200
Fort Rae, N.W.T.		
(*a*) Three-bedroom residence for new teacher-Mission Hospital	30,000	
(*b*) One-Classroom school with bachelor quarters for single teacher	60,000	
NOTE: 12 per cent recovery from the Government of the Northwest Territories of $10,800		90,000
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.		
(*a*) Three-bedroom residence with basement for additional teacher	29,000	
(*b*) Additional classroom to school turned over by Indian Affairs Branch	24,000	
NOTE: 28 per cent recovery from the Government of the Northwest Territories of $14,840		53,000
Fort Smith, N.W.T.		
(*a*) One double house with basement for new staff	42,500	
In addition the list includes various amounts of $5,500 and less for the construction of offices or the extension of offices.		
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T.		
Improvement of school and grounds transferred from Indian Affairs Branch		2,200
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.		
To provide for:		
(*a*) Two-classroom day school	96,000	
(*b*) Insulated and heated garage and workshop (partial est.)	63,500	
(*c*) Five native-type dwellings	37,500	
(*d*) Warehouse	5,000	
(*e*) Powerhouse	3,000	
(*f*) Fire hall	5,000	210,000
Hay River, N.W.T.		
(*a*) Addition of three classrooms and a playroom and enlarged heating system, also to provide a septic tank and water pressure system	144,000	
One storey building without basement with three small apartments for single female teachers		30,000
Miscellaneous		4,000
At Lac La Martre, one classroom log structure school for Indian pupils		10,000

Pond Inlet, N.W.T.		
Development of coal mining and briquetting project for Eskimos—plant, equipment, boiler room and shed ..		12,000
Port Harrison, P.Q.		
(*a*) Residence, office and storage for northern service officer	40,000	
(*b*) Residence for Eskimo assistance	10,000	
(*c*) Sealskin tanning plant and—2 buildings	7,000	
(*d*) Laundry and bath house	3,000	60,000
Resolute Bay		
Material for construction of 3 dwelling houses for Eskimos		12,000
The Eskimos are going to build them themselves for $12,000.		
Rocher River, N.W.T.		
Improvement to school turned over from Indian Affairs Branch		6,500
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.		
Construction of an insulated warehouse in which to store perishables and extra school supplies	1,500	
Yellowknife, N.W.T.		
Repairs to house No. 45	6,850	
Repairs to house No. 46	6,850	
Repairs to house No. 41	4,150	
I say repairs but it is insulation and soundproofing of walls and ceilings.		
Repairs to house No. 42	4,150	

All that, I think, with a few small amounts below $2,000, makes the total of $931,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: Of that total much the largest proportion is actually for school purposes. It comes to $585 thousand which is upwards of two-thirds of the total sum we are dealing with.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, including vocational training.

Mr. HARKNESS: Your new educational program is in addition to this?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. This is for federal day schools. The amounts that are going to be expended that you have calculated to be $585,000 are for federal day schools.

Mr. HARKNESS: So that your additional program is going to take the bulk of your money then.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This primary, yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: When you get your supplementary estimate in and so on?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, in this primary, yes.

Mr. HARDIE: I am afraid that if you have $10 thousand for a house for a little Eskimo assistant, all the Eskimos will want to be assistants.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know $10 thousand in the north does not build much of a house.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The cheaper houses are at Resolute Bay. The more expensive houses are for the assistants to the northern service officers.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice here there is an amount recoverable from the government of the Northwest Territories for the education of children other than Indian and Eskimo which seems to be in addition to the $163 thousand we spoke of previously. Why is that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: In the case of each of these projects account is taken of the percentage of the children who will benefit who are non-Indian and non-Eskimo, and the federal government pays only its proper share.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a share of construction cost. At Fort Simpson we estimate a recovery of 28 per cent. At Hay river we estimate a recovery of 82 per cent. It depends on the proportion of non-Eskimo, non-Indian children.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yellowknife would be 100 per cent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is a school district and there would be no recovery.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 316 carry.

Carried.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is now twenty-five minutes to six. I would move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow we will go on to item 317 and also to any questions on the fiscal agreement with the Northwest Territories.

I should say that there was a question as to a film being shown. I believe the deputy minister has something to say about that.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, there was an enquiry this morning as to whether certain films might be shown. Mr. Cunningham has been in touch with the Film Board, and if the committee desires they will have two films shown in this room at 9.30 tomorrow morning. The two films suggested are "Canada's Awakening North" and the "Land of the Long Day".

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think there will be enough people on the committee who will come, together with other hon. members if they are interested, to make it worth while to show these films at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is not a very convenient hour. I understand that when members have to sit twice a day on the committee, they like to deal with their correspondence early in the morning. If it is not suitable we might arrange to show the films another time.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do think it would be advisable to try to arrange another time because it is a very awkward hour.

The CHAIRMAN: This was the only time which could be arranged within the next three or four days. I felt myself that it was very doubtful whether enough members would turn out to make it worth while. If members would like to see these films, I take it arrangements can be made to show them at a more convenient time later on.

We shall adjourn then until tomorrow at 10.30 a.m., and we will also meet at 3.30 in the afternoon.

The committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 19

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. F. J. G. Cunningham, Director, Northern Administration and Lands Branch; Mr. G. Montsion, Head, Estimates Section; Mr. F. Fraser, Chief, Territorial Division; Mr. J. V. Jacobson, Head, Educational and Vocational Training Section; Mr. J. A. Cantley, Head, Administrative Section, Arctic Division; Mr. C. K. LeCapelain, Chief, Lands Division; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director, National Parks Branch; Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director; Mr. J. R. Coleman, Chief, National Parks and Historic Sites Division and Mr. G. L. Scott, Chief Engineer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Habel
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Simmons
Thatcher
Yuill—26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, March 29, 1955.
(24)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Cannon, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Habel, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Lesage, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Robichaud, Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. F. J. G. Cunningham, Director, Northern Administration and Lands Branch; Mr. G. Montsion, Head, Estimates Section; Mr. F. Fraser, Chief; and Mr. J. V. Jacobson, Head, Educational and Vocational Training Section, Territorial Division; Mr. J. A. Cantley, Head, Administrative Section, Arctic Division, and Mr. C. K. LeCapelain, Chief, Lands Division.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Northern Administration and Lands Branch, Mr. Lesage and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 317 to 320 inclusive and 314, were adopted.

At 12.35 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

(25)

The Special Committee on Estimates resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Cannon, Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Dupuis, Habel, Hardie, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, MacEachen, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Robichaud, Simmons, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. F. A. G. Carter, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. F. J. G. Cunningham, Director, Northern Administration and Lands Branch; Mr. G. Montsion, Head, Estimates Section; Mr. C. K. LeCapelain, Chief, Lands Division; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director, National Parks Branch; Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director; Mr. J. R. Coleman, Chief, National Parks and Historic Sites Division, and Mr. G. L. Scott, Chief Engineer.

The Committee continued the consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Northern Administration and Lands Branch.

Item numbered 313 was adopted.

56182—1½

The Committee further considered the following proposed resolution, which was moved by Mr. Thatcher on March 23.

—Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have no aggressive policy of developing or populating the Northwest Territories or the Yukon

—and Whereas our population in those areas has shown little or no growth in recent years

—and Whereas Canada's Northland economic development is lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries such as Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway.

Therefore be it resolved that this Committee recommends to Parliament that consideration should be given to the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs for the specific purpose of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

The said resolution was resolved in the negative, on division, Yeas:—5, Nays:—10.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the National Parks Branch.

Items numbered 296 to 299 inclusive were adopted.

At 5.35 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock Wednesday, March 30.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

March 29, 1955.
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen, I suggest that this morning we might take any remaining questions with regard to the statutory item of $284,147 covering payments under the fiscal agreement with the Northwest Territories. As I recall it, somebody in the committee said he wanted to ask a question about it.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have noticed increases of $11,343 for the Northwest Territories and $20,798 for the Yukon territory in this vote. Will the minister please explain the basis of this agreement and payment formula.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The amounts payable under the terms of the agreement are calculated by the Department of Finance on the following basis: The first item is:

Population subsidy of eighty cents per head based on the 1951 census	$12,803.20

The second item represents:

Compensation to the government of the Northwest Territories in consideration of its agreement to suspend and to refrain from levying individual income taxes, corporation income taxes, corporation taxes, and succession duties, as defined in the agreement, such compensation to vary upward from the guaranteed minimum annual amount of $186,000 in accordance with variations in the value of the gross national product per capita.	$271,342.81

This makes a total of $284,146.01. The increase is for compensation for suspended taxes for which $260,000 was provided in 1954-55, as compared with $271,343 for 1955-56. May I suggest that we deal at the same time with the statutory item for the Yukon Territory.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. That is further down on the page—$308,075, subsidies and compensation on page 429.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Yukon Territory the total payment is $308,074.51, made up as follows:

Grant for the support of government and legislature ...	$30,000
Population subsidy of eighty cents per head based on the 1951 census	$7,276.80
Compensation to the government of the Yukon Territory in consideration of its agreement to suspend and to refrain from levying individual income taxes, corporation income taxes, corporation taxes, and succession duties, as defined in the agreement, such compensation to vary upward from the guaranteed minimum annual amount of $170,487 in accordance with variations in the value of the gross national product per capita	$270,797.71
	$308,074.51

The increase from 1954-55 to 1955-56 is on the last item. This is because of the increase in the value of the gross national product per capita all over Canada.

Mr. HELLYER: Is that an actual increase or an anticipated increase?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is an actual increase for the past year.

Mr. SIMMONS: How does this rate of 80 cents per head compare with the rates for the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is the same. It is on the same basis as in the provinces except that Ontario, I believe, has a different basis. There is a special clause in the agreement with respect to Ontario.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Ontario taxes its own people for succession duties.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, there is a difference with regard to Ontario, but in the main it is the same agreement which we have with the provinces.

Mr. MICHENER: This is the payment under the agreement based on the gross national product. The 80 cents has nothing to do with that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, that is the statutory subsidy.

Mr. MICHENER: From what date is that?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister*): I think it is from 1907.

Mr. MICHENER: It goes back to the beginning of time, then.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know that the subsidies paid according to the constitution also go back to the beginning of time.

Mr. MICHENER: It would correspond to the British North America Act for the provinces? It has never been changed from 80 cents?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has not been changed. I do not think there has been any change in the constitutional subsidy to the provinces since the conference in 1907 called, I believe, by Mercier.

Mr. SIMMONS: Do you not think that some special consideration and assistance should be given in the period of building up and of adolescence—until the time when a province can take its stand alongside the other provinces of Canada? We all know that the cost of living is high out there, and that the cost of administration is also high.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: A great part of the territorial needs both in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories is assumed by the federal government—much more than in the case of the provinces. These statutory payments under the agreements are on the same basis as those made with the provinces, but on the other hand in the case of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories the federal expenditures in provincial fields are quite heavy apart from that.

Mr. SIMMONS: I just thought that on account of the high costs it might be possible there could be some reduction in those rates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It seems to me—I am thinking aloud, Mr. Simmons—that anything we do should be done on some other basis than the basis of the tax rental agreement, in order to keep uniformity across Canada as much as possible in the terms which are offered to the provinces. This is really not my field, but it is my thinking on the matter.

Mr. MICHENER: Could you tell me what is the budget of the administration of the Yukon territory for the corresponding period covering this amount?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Just over $2 million.

Mr. MICHENER: Then it must have other sources of revenue?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As I said yesterday, liquor profits, for instance, account for quite an amount.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the territorial administration have any borrowing power?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. From the federal government.

Mr. MICHENER: Do they use that power?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They do. For instance, I can give a definite example in connection with the new Whitehorse sewer and water system, and the establishment of the new town site. We lent money to the Territorial government and the Territorial government lent money to the city of Whitehorse. This form of help allows borrowing on very easy terms.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is there any supervision with respect to the amount which Whitehorse can borrow?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of course there is supervision, because the borrowing is done from us.

Mr. MONTEITH: You naturally can limit the amount.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Borrowing has to be specifically authorized by my department, and they can borrow only from the federal government.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think Mr. Robertson was going to produce some figures for me today with regard to the income which has been secured from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have some figures today. They are relatively complete for 1952-1953. They are not complete for 1953-1954, and we have not been able to get them later than that. But in 1952-1953 the following are the estimates of federal revenue from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

1952-53	
N.W.T.	
Individual Income Tax	$ 667,000
Corporation Income Tax	63,000
Total Income Tax	$ 730,000
Resources and Development (N. Admin. and Lands Branch)	393,000
Fisheries	10,000
Total	$1,133,000
Yukon Territory	
Individual Income Tax	$1,251,000
Corporation Income Tax	201,000
Other Taxes	112,000
Total	$1,564,000
Resources and Development (N. Admin. and Lands Branch)	262,000
Fisheries	6,000
Total	$1,832,000

As I understand it, Mr. Harkness wanted to know how these revenues compared with federal expenditure in the territories. I should add that the corporation income tax figure is not complete, because it does not include the

corporation taxes paid by large mining companies such as United Keno Hill Mines and Consolidated Mining and Smelting and mines of that sort, which have their head office in some other outside centre, because they are taxable in their place of incorporation.

Mr. HARKNESS: That would represent a considerable increase would it not.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: There would be some increase but we do not know how much.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you any general idea how much it might be?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: We have tried to get it, but Consolidated Mining and Smelting and the other companies draw part of their revenue from other sources of income, and as a result we cannot get any kind of breakdown which is really useful. But there is an unknown amount which should be added to corporation income tax on both territorial accounts.

Mr. HARKNESS: On the same lines I presume Northern Transportation does not pay income tax, and it is a crown corporation.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: That was correct up to two years ago, but it is now taxable.

Mr. HARKNESS: So the profit made by Northern Transportation should be added to this amount?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: For 1953-54 it probably was. These figures relate to the period before they were taxable.

Mr. HARKNESS: This would represent a further considerable sum. I think it might be over a million dollars.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If we are to compare expenditure and revenue in one given year, we have to keep to that given year. We had to go back to 1952-53 to get accurate figures. If you say that in the last two years revenues have increased, I can tell you that expenditures have also increased in that period. But we must compare known figures for a given year.

Mr. HARKNESS: In addition to the figures which you have given, there have been considerable revenues. Northern Transportation would produce over a million dollars this year.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: The taxable amount would have been considerably less.

Mr. HARKNESS: But all of that revenue or profit still goes into the hands of the government because it is a crown corporation.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Yes, but the total revenue is not tax revenue. It is revenue of another sort.

Mr. HARKNESS: But it is still profit as far as the government is concerned.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: If I give expenditure figures I think it will be clear that this amount would not appreciably alter the relative position between federal revenues and expenditures.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not think Mr. Robertson has finished giving us the figures for the Yukon.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: I have finished giving revenue figures.

Mr. MICHENER: What would be the total figure for the Yukon account?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: The federal expenditures in the two territories for the same year, 1952-53, were as follows:

	Northwest Territories 1952-53 $ '000	Yukon 1952-53 $ '000
A. Direct payments to the governments of the Territories		
(a) Subsidy and other payments under agreements (Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources)	239	329
(b) General health grants (Department of National Health and Welfare)	5	11
	244	340
B. Direct payments to or on behalf of individual residents of the Territories		
(a) Family allowances (Department of National Health and Welfare)	445	236
(b) Old age pensions, pensions to blind persons and old age security payments (Department of National Health and Welfare)	146	78
	591	314
C. Estimates of major expenditures by government departments or agencies within the Territories		
(a) Agriculture	33	31
(b) Office of Chief Electoral Officer	—	—
(c) Citizenship and Immigration	442	238
(d) Fisheries	104	—
(e) Justice	—	41
(f) Labour (including Unemployment Insurance Commission)	10	42
(g) Mines and Technical Surveys	1,204	488
(h) National Defence	1,212	11,779
(i) National Health and Welfare	815	431
(j) National Revenue	—	237
(k) Northern Affairs and National Resources	1,623	868
(l) Post Office	327	618
(m) Public Works	223	498
(n) Royal Canadian Mounted Police	900	354
(o) Trade and Commerce	—	1
(p) Transport (including the Canadian Maritime Commission and the National Harbours Board)	1,709	416
(q) Veterans Affairs (Soldier Settlement and Veterans Land Act)	25	35
	8,627	16,077
Total expenditures	$9,642	$16,731

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, the total result of those figures, adding the two together, would be the total amount spent on the north in that year. So far as the development of the north is concerned, we should subtract the National Defence figures.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: Not in the case of the Yukon. Of the $11 million in the estimates, $5 million is for highway maintenance. That is on the Alaska highway in the Yukon, which is of course not used solely as a defence highway. It is not simply a defence road; it is very important for Yukon development.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: At least part of it is used for the transportation of ore.

Mr. HARKNESS: There woud be, then, some $6 million of National Defence expenditure which you could reasonably subtract from this total, which would give us roughly $20 million which was spent for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. This gets us back to the argument which Mr. Lesage and Mr. Thatcher were having with regard to the total amount spent in the territory, and whether it was adequate for development or not.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was three years ago Mr. Harkness. For instance, the figure only for the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources for 1952-53 was $1.6 million for the Northwest Territories and $868,000 for the Yukon, a total of approximately $2,500,000. For 1955-56 the figures are: for the Northwest Territories $9,953,000—approximately $4 million, which is more than double—and for the Yukon the figure of $868,000 in 1952-53 compare with $2,092,000 in 1955-56 which is 2-½ times as much. And the increases in the other departments are also considerable.

Mr. HARKNESS: We realize that there have been increases, but the general situation that I was trying to get at was really this: how much have we been paying for the north? With regard to quite a number of those items I am a little doubtful as to whether or not they should be included as development items, or even "care" items as far as the northern population is concerned.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, I cannot put more money backwards into 1952-1953.

Mr. THATCHER: Would this be an appropriate time to put my motion.

Mr. DUPUIS: Any time. We are ready to vote against it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We could have taken it yesterday afternoon had you been here.

Mr. THATCHER: I had to be in the House yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest you wait until we get through with Northern Affairs, and then vote on it.

Mr. MICHENER: I have another question to ask on this, Mr. Chairman. Is that total which Mr. Robertson gave supposed to be the entire expenditure of the department of National Defence for that year in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: For that year, yes.

Mr. MICHENER: It does not sound like a very large sum if we bear in mind what we have heard about defence activities in the northern part of Canada.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: A large part of the National Defence expenditure in our northern territories is, in fact, on the Churchill base, which, of course, is in Manitoba, and it does not appear in this context. There are, I think, the total expenditures on National Defence in the territories for that particular year, but they have gone up substantially since.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we come to item 317 which is under the heading "Forest Conservation and Wildlife Management including Wood Buffalo Park; operation and maintenance $433,970."

Mr. HARKNESS: We were told the other day that one of the chief enemies of the reindeer, and particularly of the caribou and other animals is the wolf, and other predators. What has been done so far as predatory animals are concerned, under this item?

Mr. F. FRASER (*Chief Territorial Division*): We operate in conjunction with the provinces in the northern part of Saskatchewan and the southern part of the Northwest Territories, and the northern part of Alberta and the southern part of the Northwest Territories, in those areas which are contiguous. In so far as the areas outside of Wood Buffalo park are concerned, the money is voted by the territorial government. In so far as Wood Buffalo park is concerned, it is voted by the federal government. The campaign consists of dropping poison baits at particular points which we expect to be regularly frequented by predatory animals. These points are visited, the carcasses are picked up in so far as possible and a record is kept of each kill, together with sex, age, and other statistics. The program has been particularly active since the rabies epidemic.

Mr. SIMMONS: What has been done in the Yukon with regard to wolves?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On this subject of predator control, I may say that the chief of our wildlife service, Mr. Mair, could be called upon to give some explanation about what is being done. He gave a paper to the recent North American wildlife conference in Montreal on predator control, so if members of the committee would be interested in going further into this matter we could pass over now to another item and call on him and have him give us an explanation about the wildlife of the Northwest Territories especially as regards predator control. This could be asked of him when we get to the item relating to wildlife under the National Parks branch, which would be tomorrow or even, possibly, this afternoon. Would that be convenient?

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not care how the information comes out. I just wanted to get some idea of what is being done in this matter.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Then would you mind postponing the discussion on predator control?

Mr. HARDIE: Are we moving from this item?

Mr. HARKNESS: No. We are discussing various services.

Mr. HARDIE: I understood Mr. Fraser to say that the territorial government pay for predator control outside of Wood Buffalo park. Is that correct?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: That is correct.

Mr. HARDIE: The game is being preserved for the natives, and the natives are the federal government's responsibility. I feel therefore that this should be budgeted by the department and not by the Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: The wildlife of the Territory constitutes the one resource which is entirely under territorial control. This is an item from which the territorial government gets revenue.

Mr. HARDIE: How does the cost of this predator control compare with the amount of money received by the territorial government out of this?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: It is much less than the revenue, Mr. Hardie. But the question of predator control, as Mr. Mair will probably say when he discusses the subject, is a complicated one, and it is a very moot point how far it is really practicable to go with it. Mr. Hardie is aware of this fact.

Mr. HARKNESS: About the warden service—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The warden service is under Northern Affairs.

Mr. HARKNESS: For Buffalo park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For the whole of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. HARDIE: As the department carries out this wolf bait program, what are they doing with the hides of these wolves? Will they allow the natives to take the hides or do they take them themselves and destroy them?

Mr. F. FRASER: The hides are destroyed. You cannot skin the wolf where it lies because the wolf will invariably be frozen. This means you would have to take the animal back to Fort Smith, for example, in order to thaw it out before skinning it, and the amount derived from the hide would not repay all that trouble.

Mr. HARDIE: But suppose there were trappers in the immediate area, and suppose that, let us say, 20 or 30 wolves are knocked down. Would the department allow the natives in the vicinity to take those wolves?

Mr. F. FRASER: I do not see anything against that, but the department would have to have information regarding how many wolves were killed.

Mr. HARDIE: Could that not be done under the supervision of the warden in that locality?

Mr. F. FRASER: The baits are put down at widely scattered points. I do not think it would be possible for the warden to go around with the trappers to oversee the skinning of the animals.

Mr. HARDIE: But the warden has to go there to get the required statistical information.

Mr. F. FRASER: They go back.

Mr. HARDIE: Why cannot he at the same time take some of the hunters and trappers around that area, and say to them: "If you want to come out and take the wolves you can come along."

Mr. F. FRASER: The trapper would still be faced with the problem of getting the wolves back to his camp and thawing them out.

Mr. HARDIE: He would set up a camp there and do that.

Mr. FRASER: I do not think the trapper would be attracted by that at the present time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We might try it, Mr. Hardie. We can try what you have suggested.

Mr. HARDIE: The people there are interested.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Thank you for your suggestion. We shall pass it on to the wardens.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the reason for the reduction in the number of wardens from 17 to 15?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Perhaps Mr. Hardie would care to answer that.

Mr. HARDIE: I feel that the warden's service has gone far enough. We want to look after the interests of the natives rather than pay too much attention to the caribou or the lesser game. There is game in the country, and with a certain amount of protection, the amount of game will increase without establishing warden's stations all over the region to tell these natives what they cannot do. The wardens are more or less an enforcement branch, and when they see these government houses being built all over the country for wardens, the natives wonder what these people are doing for them. I went to the minister a year ago and asked him if he could not curtail the number of wardens, or at least manage with the number which he had at that time on this control scheme. I notice that this year he has reduced his staff by one or two, and I am very happy about it. I think that money could be spent in ways which are a lot better.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many wardens are in Buffalo park and elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are three wardens and six patrol stations with 31 people engaged in warden services in Wood Buffalo park.

Mr. HARKNESS: And how many are there outside? Those are the ones which Mr. Hardie is interested in.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are 12 warden stations and 37 employees are engaged in warden services for the Mackenzie district.

Mr. HARDIE: In Good Hope and all those places along the Mackenzie river they have R.C.M.P. detachments, and in 1946 before the department brought in their own game branch, the R.C.M.P. did this work, and in a lot of these places I feel they could still do it without the necessity for setting up more warden stations, and for my part I am happy to see this item cut.

Mr. HARKNESS: There was duplication of effort in other words?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no. I am not going to start an argument with Mr. Hardie on this score. I have listened to his representations very carefully, and I have asked my officials to curtail the warden service where possible, but the reduction was to be in keeping with good principles of conservation in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. HARDIE: This could be handled without the warden stations.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not agree with you.

Mr. HARDIE: Do you think that there should be a warden station in every settlement?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, that is not my belief at all. As you see, we are dispensing with some wardens. But there should be wardens wherever there is a sufficient number of trappers and hunters.

Mr. SIMMONS: A very large number of the police are ex officio game wardens.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are enforcement officers, but not conservation officers.

Mr. HENRY: Can they do everything? It seems to me they have too much to do in the line of their own duties.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HENRY: Are there many prosecutions?

Mr. FRASER: The people are very law abiding. Hunting is not allowed by the public, and that is the field where you get a great many infractions—among itinerant hunters.

Mr. MICHENER: And there are few itinerant hunters up there.

Mr. FRASER: That is so.

Mr. MICHENER: The wardens in this field are described as park wardens. I see no other wardens mentioned at all here. I presume anyone outside the park would be a game warden. I do not see anyone here described as that.

Mr. FRASER: That is a civil service classification.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: All the wardens are called park wardens whether they work in Wood Buffalo park or elsewhere. It is really a misnomer. We have tried to correct it, but the Civil Service Commission did not want to adopt a separate classification. Our game wardens are not concerned solely with the prosecution of those who infringe the law. They are more concerned with the inculcation of the principles of proper game management and conservation. The primary responsibility for prosecutions rests with the R.C.M.P. The primary responsibility of the game wardens is to see that the trappers learn the best method of processing and preserving the furs which they take. We concentrate on the constructive side of a game warden's responsibilities.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Harkness was asking yesterday about the caribou herds and whether they are being depleted, and the point of conservation measures comes out clearly in connection with them. We have recently had an extensive survey extending over three years to try to determine whether the herds are being depleted or not, and the report became available about a month ago. The best estimates that our wild life people can make is that there is probably a net depletion to the extent of about 32,000 animals per year. This is obviously an estimated figure—an estimate of the natural depletion. They also estimate that the wastage caused by inadequate handling and incomplete use of carcasses, failure to follow up wounded animals and so on may amount to about the entire net decrease in the numbers of the herds. In other words, they think there is a wastage of about 30,000 carcasses a year through inadequate handling, failure to follow desirable practices with regard to the preservation of meat use of carcasses and that sort of thing. The Wild Life Service is, among other things, trying to improve this state of affairs. They are seeking to encourage a better utilization of the wild life—not simply caribou—so that the wastage will not be so great as it has been in the past. There are also other aspects of conservation, but the general purpose is the same.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think that yesterday you said that you did not anticipate that the numbers of caribou would materially decrease, but at the rate of wastage you have just given it appears that in 20 years they will be gone completely.

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: If conservation measures succeed in reducing that figure appreciably we would come to something approaching the annual use of the natural increase of the herds. There would then be no net depletion. It depends on the extent to which the overall wastage is reduced or the rate of usage changed.

Mr. MICHENER: And you are depending on the wardens to bring about this conservation?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON: On our educational program generally.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: A distinction should be made between the caribou which the Eskimo use and the caribou which the Indians use. They are different herds. Yesterday we were talking about the future of the caribou in the Keewatin area, and there, I believe, the statement which was made is quite true because those are not the same herds as those which the natives in the Mackenzie district, where our wardens work, utilize. The decline or wastage is greater, I think, in the Mackenzie district than in Keewatin.

Mr. MICHENER: If your wardens are the means of preserving the herds in the Mackenzie area, surely you would not want to reduce the number of wardens?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: We are not reducing them in any harmful manner. For example, the warden station at Yellowknife has been dispensed with because it is an economic waste to have a warden station continue there.

Mr. MICHENER: I would think the wardens might come to be regarded as friends of the people hunting in the area. Is that not the case?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know, Mr. Michener, that there is always a great job of education to be done. I remember that the old farmers in my own province used a few years ago to look on agronomists as enemies. Now they are convinced that they are friends and they are glad to learn from them. Quite a task of education is involved in order to impress on these people that the wardens are there to help them and not to embarrass them.

An Hon. MEMBER: It is the same with commercial fishermen and biologists.

Mr. HARDIE: I am inclined to think that the wardens have done something in the last few years to help the hunters and trappers, but prior to that they were strictly there to tell people what they could not do.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, Mr. Hardie, we have a system of meetings of the wardens. We had one about three or four weeks ago in Yellowknife, and there they got their instructions as to the kind of work they should do. This does a lot of good.

Mr. HARDIE: I agree with you. But did not Mr. Cunningham say that there was more wastage in the Mackenzie river district, where there are warden offices and have been since 1946, than there is in the Keewatin district?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Did you get the question, Mr. Cunningham? Mr. Hardie asked how it comes about that you say there is more wastage in the Mackenzie river district, where there are wardens, than in the Keewatin district—the Eskimo land.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, that is my belief, Mr. Chairman, and that is why we have the wardens in the Mackenzie district.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you explain why that is? I am curious to find out, if no one else is.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The caribou in Keewatin are taken, with few exceptions, by the Eskimos. The Eskimos know the traditional migration paths of the caribou and normally wait for them in narrow defiles or places where the caribou are known to cross rivers. They lie in ambush, and then in the space of 12 to 48 hours they kill enough animals to establish a stock pile for use in the ensuing year. They follow wounded animals down stream to where there is a convenient eddy or bay, and butcher them on the spot. That is not the custom of the Indians of the Mackenzie district in hunting caribou. It is a good deal better than the technique of hunting used by the Rae Indians, which is more wasteful than the Eskimo technique.

Mr. HARDIE: I think Mr. Cunningham would agree that the population in the Keewatin area is just a small fraction of the population living in the Mackenzie area.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: That is another reason.

Mr. HARDIE: It is because of the population.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As Mr. Cunningham says, that is another reason.

Mr. HARDIE: Do you not feel that the wastage along the Mackenzie could be obviated by some such action as the Department of Indian Affairs is taking now in operating freezers and aiding the native Indians to store their meat in the freezers before the thaw comes in the spring. I agree that a few years back the killing in the Northwest Territories was wasteful because the hunters were using ·22 rifles. Today they are not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: That is very heartening.

Mr. HARDIE: The wastage due to the use of ·22 rifles is disappearing. Today the wastage occurs for another reason. A hunter will knock down a number of caribou to keep him during the winter. When the spring comes, he probably still has caribou left. He has no place to put the caribou so that it will keep during the summer, and as a result, that meat is wasted. If freezers were built in suitable places and the department could help these people with regard to transport this difficulty might be solved.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The question of providing freezers for the use of the Indians is of course the responsibility of the Indian Affairs branch. They are embarking on a program now.

Mr. HARDIE: Do you not think that such a system would obviate some of this wastage.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. That is one of the reasons why we are fairly confident that the numbers of caribou will not materially decrease in future.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if this is the proper place to ask about the advisory board on wild life services. Would the minister tell us something about its personnel?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I suggest that we deal with this when we get to the wild life division of the National Parks branch.

Mr. MICHENER: I do not quite understand the situation with regard to these wardens. I think the minister said that there were 31 employed in this service as far as Wood Buffalo park is concerned, and some 30-odd outside.

An Hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. MICHENER: However, I see that the total number of employees is only 79 for the various services. Possibly that means that practically all the employees are engaged in this wardens' service.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In various services for the Mackenzie district and Wood Buffalo park. There are 70 employees engaged in this work, assisted by casual employees as required, for which 15 man-years are provided in the estimates.

Mr. HARDIE: Part of the warden's duties are in forest conservation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What page are you on?

Mr. HARKNESS: We are now on page 424. The figures which you gave do not seem to agree too well.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The figures I gave—let me repeat it—was: 47 employees for game management in the Mackenzie district; 31 employees in Wood Buffalo park—wardens plus casual employees rated at 7 man-years—and 17 employees engaged in forest conservation, plus casual employees representing 15 man-years. A number of these positions are classified as labourers, and labourers (casual).

Mr. HARKNESS: The figures you have given total 85 plus these seasonal people, and the numbers given there are only 79. The 79 includes 16 casual workers so there are really 16 regular employees, but you have given 85.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have here: game management, Mackenzie district—oh, what I gave you, Mr. Harkness, were the figures for 1954. I am sorry. The figures for 1955 are: 31 employees including seasonal employees for game management in the Mackenzie district. For the Wood Buffalo park warden service, 31 employees, equivalent to 21 man-years, and for forest conservation 17 employees equivalent to 11½ man-years, making a total of 79 regular employees, plus 22 casuals and others for a grand total of 82 man-years.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is one other thing. I see you have a revenue of $42,850. How is that revenue derived.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can give an approximation for 1955-56:

General hunting licenses	$ 160
Fur export permits	$ 2,500
Sale of buffalo meat	$20,000
Sale of reindeer meat	$20,000

This makes a total of $42,660.

Mr. HARKNESS: I thought you said that those fur export licences were all income of the territories themselves?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Except with respect to Wood Buffalo Park. That is a federal park.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is where the $2,000 comes from, from the buffalo hides?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, from Wood Buffalo Park. Other animals besides buffaloes are caught in the park.

Mr. HARKNESS: I see under the heading of forestry management in this area that the amount to cover it has remained pretty close to the same sum.

Mr. FRASER: You mean Wood Buffalo Park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It comes under the Lands Division.

Mr. HARKNESS: You mean for the whole matter of forests? We will wait for that heading?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: What about supplies and provisions for working crews? Are they procured on tender, or how are they supplied?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Petroleum products and other materials and supplies; yes. I know that petroleum is purchased on a tender basis because the tenders come before me every time.

Mr. MICHENER: What about provisions for work crews, $23,332; that is the item next above it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are ordered from Ottawa by tender.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the point from which they are shipped?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mostly from Edmonton.

Mr. HARDIE: And petroleum products?

Mr. FRASER: They are produced in the Northwest Territories mostly; some are shipped from Alberta.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Usually the lowest tender is that of Imperial Oil, because of its refinery up there.

Mr. MICHENER: You have forest fire suppression $23,200. What was the expenditure on that account? Last year was it for chartered planes which supplied the services?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will give you the details. The expenditure for 1954-55 is a forecast because the year is not finished yet; the amount is $41,300.

Mr. MICHENER: Who were the companies which supplied the services?

Mr. FRASER: We entered into a special contract with one of the charter companies because most of the plane service is required at Fort Smith, and there is not sufficient business at Fort Smith to warrant any charter company keeping a plane there, if we just ordered as required. So, in order to ensure continuous service of a plane at Fort Smith during the fire season, we entered into a contract with a company, guaranteeing them six hundred hours of flying time a year.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the company?

Mr. FRASER: Associated Airways.

Mr. HARKNESS: You are going to do less of that work this year?

Mr. FRASER: Last year we employed a helicopter but this year we are not. It was on account of the helicopter.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried. Item 318 "Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment" $134,639; and the details are at page 426.

Mr. HARKNESS: Construction of roads and trails is listed at $4,620. They are in the park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. That is for Wood Buffalo Park.

Mr. HELLYER: Are there any facilities offered the public by the park?

Hon Mr. LESAGE: No, it is an animal preserve.

Mr. HARDIE: Construction of buildings and works; part of that would be —as Mr. Robertson mentioned yesterday—for the buffalo slaughter in the park.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, Mr. Hardie. Nothing has been yet provided for that expenditure. I might mention the provisions. I will pass over the small amounts; $7,500 for one house and laboratory for the mammologist of the Canadian wildlife service; $4,420 for erection of a fire control tower in the park. At Hay river, a combination office and warehouse, $7,000; and at Fort Norman, a combination office and warehouse, $7,000; at Fort Rae, the same thing, $7,000; at Fort Simpson, to put a foundation under the warden's residence, $7,000; and various amounts of $2,000 and less at Fort Smith, Fort Resolution, Pine Point, Pine lake, Fort Providence, Rocher river and Trout lake.

Mr. MICHENER: Acquisition of equipment. What type of equipment is this? It shows an increase of $15,000 over the year before?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is due mainly to provision of a "bombardier" snowmobile for Aklavik, and a replacement engine for a launch, the MB Beaver, which is used in the park for patrol work. Those are the two expenditures; for the purchase of a "bombardier" snowmobile, which is $6,300, and replacement of an engine for this launch, the MB Beaver, which is $7,000.

Mr. HARDIE: Will there be anything done this year on new squeeze pens in the buffalo park for the slaughter next fall?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not this year.

Mr. HARDIE: Did you not mention a policy yesterday of handling TB buffalo? Will that not start until the following year?

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think the answer is that there will probably be an increased slaughter next year. It cannot be a selective, controled anti-TB program until we get permanent equipment. But it is being worked out. It was too late to make provision for it in this year's estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Carried.

Item 319 "Operation and Maintenance", $624,629. The details are at page 426. The minister has suggested that we take up items 319 and 320 together.

Mr. MICHENER: The payments for maintenance increased last year by $41,200, but this year there is nothing. Is there any change in policy there?

Mr. FRASER: Under the new Yukon Act, the Yukon territory assumes that responsibility which, previously had been borne by the federal government.

Mr. HARKNESS: There are only 31 employees here. This includes the forest service, from which I would take it that the amount of forest service must be very very small. What has been done in regard to that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For forest services we have 11 employees in and around Whitehorse; one in Dawson; one on the Liard river; one at Haines Junction; one at Kluane lake; two at Mayo, one at "Teslin", and one at "Watson lake".

Mr. HARKNESS: Is this to provide fire watching services?

Mr. FRASER: Yes, that is entirely forestry. They also assist the territorial government in the enforcement of game ordinances. That is, they perform certain warden services for the territorial government.

Mr. HARKNESS: If a fire should break out there, what means is there for dealing with it? The number of people would be inadequate to do much about it.

Mr. FRASER: Under the Forest Fire Protection, Ordinance they have authority to go out and requisition people off the street, and compel them to go and fight the fire.

Mr. MICHENER: If people are requisitioned, they are paid?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there a vote for that purpose?

Mr. FRASER: That would appear in the territorial government accounts.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is an item of $130,500 which covers the federal contribution to the Yukon territorial government of 50 per cent of the cost of maintaining the Whitehorse-Mayo road.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS: And the same contribution is being made toward resurfacing a part of the same road in the amount of $20,000, which is 50 per cent of the cost. I am glad to see this item, as the original gravel surface has worn very thin in some places and certainly needs renewing. But I do not think this item will go very far towards the cost of resurfacing this road. There should be a lot done to it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is intended to do part of the work. I think that $20,000 is 50 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS: What part of the road?

Mr. FRASER: Such part as the contractor will decide. He will resurface part each year. The item will be a recurring item, and that amount of $40,000 will be spent each year over the next four or five years.

Mr. SIMMONS: I would like to call the attention of the minister to the ferries over the Yukon, Pelly, and Stewart rivers, which form part of this road. These ferries create a bottle neck and they cannot operate during the fall freeze-up and spring break-up periods. The times and lengths of these periods vary from year to year. The length of the freeze-up periods varies too according to the weight of the traffic. For instance, it is possible to take a light vehicle over the ice after two or three weeks of freezing weather, but it is often two months before the ice is strong enough to carry a heavily loaded truck. There are not only these periods when through traffic cannot operate on the road, but, even when the ferries are operating, traffic is slowed up considerably by the ferries. All these delays add to the cost of doing business in the areas served by this road. By this I do not mean to detract from the very useful part which this road is playing in the economic life of the Yukon. However, I trust that the hon. minister will consider the fact that the time is fast approaching when these ferries should be replaced with permanent bridges.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This road is used mainly for the transportation of ore from the Keno district, and mainly by the United Keno Hill Company. My deputy has discussed the matter with the president of the company and I will ask him to say what was the result of that conversation.

Mr. ROBERTSON: We did have some discussion recently on this matter with Mr. Connell and other officers of the company. As you know, the road crosses three wide rivers. We are this year building one bridge across a much narrower river, the Tahkini river, at a cost of $200,000. The cost of bridging the three wider rivers would be somewhere in the vicinity of $\$\frac{3}{4}$ million per bridge. We had a discussion with the United Keno Hill people, and we asked them if they thought that would be a desirable way to spend that amount of money. Their answer was that it would not be. They thought that that amount of money could be much better spent than on three bridges as costly as those three would be.

Mr. SIMMONS: Is it your responsibility to contribute towards the cost of those bridges?

Mr. ROBERTSON: We were not discussing their contributing towards it. The general question was whether they thought it would be a wise expenditure of that amount of money. They said no, that there were better ways of spending that amount of money.

Mr. SIMMONS: It is a feeder road, and it runs adjacent to mineral areas all through the Yukon. I would think it was surely the responsibility of the federal government.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do not quarrel with you on that score. We consulted the officials of the company which uses the road most.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is one company?

Mr. MICHENER: There is an agreement which has to be lived up to, is there not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The agreement does not mention the bridges.

Mr. MICHENER: Who maintains the ferries?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The territorial government.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have some figures of the number of vehicles which go over that road. This one company operates a fleet of 75 highway units. Last year they ran up a mileage of 3¼ million miles, and in 1954 they carried 55,300 tons of base metal and concentrates and asbestos fibre into Whitehorse, and 27,500 tons of general freight to the mines, comprising a gross movement of 82,800 tons. The transport division employs an average of 150 men in the Whitehorse area and the payroll last year amounted to over $700,000 in addition to which the company purchased $256,000 in goods and services in Whitehorse during the same period.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is why we discussed the matter with Mr. Connell.

Mr. SIMMONS: I would think that when the time comes to put in these bridges they should put in all three of them simultaneously as an integrated unit. I think it would be cheaper in the long run for the government to have one contractor put in the three bridges at one time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not an engineer. I would have to consult Public Works on that.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is another item covering the contribution of 60 per cent of the cost of reconstructing the road between Flat creek and Dawson airport. That is part of the all weather road which connects Dawson and the Klondike with Whitehorse, and from there with the rest of Canada and North America via the Alaska highway. The people of the Yukon were very glad to see this road built during the past few years and to know that sums are being provided to rebuild the part between Flat creek and the Dawson airport. However, the road which has been built is only about fourteen feet wide and is too narrow, and no time should be lost in making it wider. This road, I think, was built by the territorial government.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They only paid 40 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS: I mean, jointly by the federal government.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Sixty per cent was paid by the federal government and 40 per cent was paid by the territorial government. It is not a resource road. There is no ore carried over it.

Mr. SIMMONS: That work was carried out by the territorial government with their own equipment?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS: I do not think it is right. I do not think that the government should compete against free enterprise. I am not a socialist, let me tell you that, but we have several small contracting firms up there which would

like to have that kind of work, and which would be glad to do it. But what do they do? When a contract comes up, they send out and bring in an outfit from Vancouver, and the little man is not given a chance. I think you will agree with me on this, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Either we follow the tender basis or we do not. If the lowest tender comes from Vancouver or Edmonton, and the second lowest is from White Horse, we have to follow our policy of giving the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SIMMONS: When you were building the Mayo White Horse road, we did not have the small contractors before with the required equipment. It cost the government a whole lot more to build that road than if they had let the contract in White Horse.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I was not in the department at that time. You can comment on this if you wish, Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The decision was taken to connect Dawson with the White Horse-Mayo road by building a road from the city of Dawson to the place where the White Horse-Mayo road crosses the Stewart river, a distance of approximately 120 miles. At that time there was in existence a 29-mile stretch from Dawson city east to Flat Creek, about 50 years old, a gravel road 14 feet in width, passable but not good. We calculated the cost of providing a 24-foot road from Flat Creek to Stewart Crossing at over $1 million. The Treasury Board would not approve of that expenditure. This was under a previous minister and deputy minister. It was, however, possible to get a half a million dollars for the purpose, provided the territorial government contributed 40 per cent of the cost, and an agreement was therefore made, with the concurrence of the Council of the Yukon Territory that we should build this road. In exploring every possible way of getting the best value for the money, the conclusion was reached that the best way of getting value was to use the equipment and engineers which the territorial government had, supplementing that equipment by the rental of equipment from small contractors and adding to the engineering staff an engineer of the federal government. These arrangements were approved by everyone concerned at the time, and they did result in obtaining excellent value for the money. I personally went over the route before construction was commenced; I went over it again in its first year of construction, and again at the end of the second year, and we did get for our half million dollars a road varying in travel surface from 18 to 22 feet—an excellent gravel road. The purpose of this money being voted for 1955-56 is to bring the westerly 29 miles, which is 50 years old, up to the same standard as the remainder.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am glad to see that you say you hired equipment from some of these local people down there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: He said "small operators".

Mr. SIMMONS: But there was a lot of discrimination at that time. I know that little operators could not get a piece of equipment on there. The people concerned with the construction would go somewhere else to persons who were not in the construction business and hire equipment from them, and let these poor little operators sit around with their equipment ready to use, but they would not hire it. I do not think that is right at all. There was too much going on at that time, and I am glad to see that it is not going on under the present minister.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This road was pretty good when we travelled over it last year.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, pretty good, though slightly dusty.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said at Dawson, you remember, that I would do my best to provide the necessary money to construct a road between Flat Creek and Dawson, and they were pretty happy about it.

Mr. SIMMONS: And they are happy today. All I am saying is that that road is too narrow, for one thing, and there is only gravel on it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will keep that in mind.

Mr. SIMMONS: On the same subject of the Dawson road, has the minister considered continuing the sixty mile road to connect with the highway in Alaska?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not at the moment. We thought that the first thing necessary was to build the road between Flat Creek and Dawson, and we will consider the suggestion you are making now—a suggestion which I heard mentioned many times in the three days I was in Dawson city last summer.

Mr. SIMMONS: I know that. Dawson is a most historical spot, the most historical in the whole north land, and once a good road is there the city would really attract a flourishing tourist traffic. They need that road because the population is dwindling. They have got hundreds of historic sites which are very interesting to everybody.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am told by my officials that there is an item of $20,000 in the estimates of the territorial administration to make a start on it this year.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HARDIE: I think the minister has said that no ore has been over that road.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said no ore between Dawson and Stewart crossing.

Mr. HARDIE: Is the policy different in the Yukon, then, from the policy with regard to the Northwest Territories? I was thinking about water transportation between White Horse and Dawson. Yesterday the minister said while he was considering the estimates with regard to the Northwest Territories that as long as there was water transportation there would be no use building roads.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is no longer water transportation on the Yukon river, except that which started last summer with the running of the tourist boat called the "Klondike".

Mr. HARDIE: They cut that out because of the road, did they not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no.

Mr. MONTEITH: For how many months of the year are these roads open?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: All the year round. You have to keep in mind that the precipitation in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon is not as high as it is in Ottawa.

Mr. SIMMONS: As you know, Mr. Minister, the American government has constructed the Canol road at a cost of many millions of dollars, but they are just letting it go to pot. This road travels through a highly mineralized area and it would only cost a very small sum to keep the Yukon portion of the road in repair, and I would suggest to the minister that consideration be given to doing a little work in order to keep it up.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is a very badly located road, Mr. Simmons. There are summits there which make it impossible to maintain in wintertime. There are very high grades on the road, and it is really an uneconomic road. That is one of the reasons why we spent last year $50,000, or maybe a little less—the estimate was $50,000—to survey a road from Carmacks to Ross River crossing.

We have been providing a few thousand dollars as a contribution to one mining company, Prospectors Airways, so that they can keep the Canol road in shape for the use they are making of it, and we are doing the same this year.

Mr. SIMMONS: That road which you are figuring on abondoning, runs, they tell me, through a highly mineralized area. It would be wise to spend a few dollars on it to keep it in condition.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what we are doing, and we are doing it in conjunction with Prospectors Airways which is one of the companies doing the prospecting there. We do not know what we shall do in the future. It may be economically sound to spend more money to maintain this road, depending on the finds made by Prospectors Airways in that mineralized area. We have an open mind on the question. We are certainly contributing to the maintenance of the road now to the extent it is needed for its present use, that is, the use being made of it by the prospectors.

Mr. SIMMONS: I would not presume to teach the government the three R's. It knows more about them than I do—roads, railroads and radio stations —and I am sure the minister is taking all these factors into consideration.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said that yesterday.

Mr. SIMMONS: However, up until recently I must admit that we have had pretty niggardly treatment with regard to our roads.

Mr. HARDIE: A lot better than we have had.

Mr. SIMMONS: However I feel now that we are going to get really good treatment. The minister has vision and I am sure we are not going to have any complaints in future.

Mr. MICHENER: Have you got any motor cars in that country?

Mr. SIMMONS: Around 10,000 up there now.

Mr. HELLYER: With regard to these new roadways—are we getting rights of way?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We own the land.

Mr. SIMMONS: I think I should have included Mr. Robertson in my remarks because I know he is doing everything he can.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 319, operation and maintenance?

Mr. HARKNESS: At the bottom of the page I see: "Contribution to the cost of constructing resource roads—$150,000". How much does the government give towards the cost of constructing one of these resource roads? This is at the bottom of page 477. In that case it is the United Keno Mill Mines.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a 75 per cent contribution.

Mr. HARKNESS: On the part of the dominion government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of the federal government, yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is that the general policy where one of these resort roads is built—that the dominion government pays 75 per cent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you remember, Mr. Harkness, I outlined the policy yesterday, and I did not mention any percentage for federal participation. It varies.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what I was asking about.

Mr. MONTEITH: This is a private agreement between Keno mines and the federal government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: A special agreement. May I quote again what I said yesterday:

"Resource roads would be those deemed essential to the effective exploitation of some natural resource. Capital and maintenance costs of such roads should be borne by the federal government or divided between the federal government and any interested private company."

The percentage of the division is not mentioned in that ruling. However, as I said yesterday, we intend to try and have this policy revised.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, it depends in each case on the agreement which you can make. In some cases I take it, you pay the entire cost.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, and in some cases only 50 per cent, as for example, in the maintenance of the White Horse—Mayo road.

Mr. SIMMONS: In the area which this survey covers there was produced last year approximately 6,758,000 ounces of silver; 32,550,169 pounds of lead; 23,096,529 pounds of zinc and 215,425 pounds of cadmium with a total value of approximately $13,100,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, Mr. Simmons, but that production has been coming out over the present road. This road is really not for the purpose of that production—it is to open up an area for other mines.

Mr. SIMMONS: But the construction of this road should contribute towards a reduction in mining costs and towards an increase in mineral production.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but this production has been coming out over the present road system.

Mr. MONTEITH: The minister was saying a moment ago that no specific percentage was fixed in the case of these agreements.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The policy rule does not state any percentage. The agreements do.

Mr. MONTEITH: Yes, that is correct. Pardon me. I think you also added a word to the effect that you hoped to have that changed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I hope to have policy revised as to road construction in the north.

Mr. MONTEITH: Setting out a specific ratio?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not exactly.

Mr. MONTEITH: Do you not think it would be better?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MONTEITH: But in one instance you pay 50 per cent, and in another 100 per cent? What variable circumstances may arise to make this necessary?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The degree of development of the area, the number of companies interested, the amount of ore that may come out, the revenue to the federal government which is involved—these are all aspects which we have to take into account.

Mr. HELLYER: And, of course, the other users of the road.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: I realize there has to be a fair amount of flexibility in any arrangement on these lines, but you have said that the contribution of the government may vary from 50 per cent to 100 per cent. This gives plenty of room for favouritism, or charges of favouritism and other things of that sort, and it is always a bit dangerous.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The usual charge is that we are too rigid, not that the system is too flexible. That is Mr. Thatcher's charge.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is another item of $950,000 for the construction of roads and bridges—

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 319?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This is $750,000 for the Whitehorse bridge and $200,000 for the Tahkini bridge. That is the construction of a bridge across the Yukon river at Whitehorse in connection with the new hospital there.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am glad to see this because the future of the Yukon depends on the development of the mining industry, and on transportation, so we feel very happy to see this item in the estimates.

Mr. HARKNESS: I take it this $950,000 is all for bridges and that there is no road construction in the Yukon projected at all apart from these resource roads.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What about the $60,000 for building the road from Flat Creek to Dawson, and the $20,000 which the territorial government is going to spend on the road from Dawson to the Alaska border, and the $150,000 for construction of a road from Elsa to Keno?

Mr. SIMMONS: I wonder if the minister could mention something about the airfields at Mayo and Dawson. Are they a territorial responsibility?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The Department of Transport is responsible.

Mr. SIMMONS: I believe that a few years ago they surveyed Flat Creek in connection with a new airport, and also just out of Mayo. I have landed and taken off from these airfields on a good many occasions, and can tell the committee that they are very hazardous. I hope something can be done to get a start on the construction of new airfields at Mayo and Dawson.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, this will have to be referred to my colleague the Minister of Transport, who deals with airfields.

Mr. HARDIE: You are in trouble here, Mr. Simmons.

Mr. SIMMONS: I may be, a little. Nevertheless the minister coordinates all these things, and he does a good job.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will speak to Mr. Marler about it.

Mr. SIMMONS: That field in Dawson is very hazardous, and it is a wonder a bunch of tourists have not been killed there before now.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I know it is, because my experience was that the R.C.A.F. in Whitehorse refused to fly me there because of the hazardous condition of the airport.

Mr. SIMMONS: I hope you will look into this, Mr. Minister, and see what can be done. A survey has already been made.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: But it allowed me to make a very pleasant motor trip with you, during which time we discussed all the needs of the Yukon.

Mr. SIMMONS: That was all pre-arranged.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we are on item 313—lands division. Administration.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask one question about forest fire experience in 1954. I see the report brings the figures to the end of 1953. How many fires were there last year, and what area was burnt over?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Are you speaking now of the Yukon or of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Harkness?

Mr. HARKNESS: I am referring to the Yukon.

Mr. FRASER: It was a very good fire season in both the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. MICHENER: Was it better than 1953?

Mr. FRASER: An exceptionally good season in both territories.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 314? I take it that we can.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 313. Lands division. Administration of territorial and public lands. Details on page 417. Seed grain collections, $405,837.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister give us some details about this seed grain collection.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Do you have the annual report with you, Mr. Thatcher? Can you get hold of a copy? I have all the figures to the end of the fiscal year 1953-54, and I can, if that will suit you, put in a complete report. I have here all the figures up to the 15th of March, 1955 which could be printed in the report. Would that be satisfactory to you?

The CHAIRMAN: That is agreed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Then the whole document will be made available.

Current Data on Seed Grain Accounts—15 March, 1955

Advances of Seed Grain, Fodder for animals and Relief were made to needy settlers in Western Canada in almost every year from 1876 to 1926. The total amount advanced was:

Manitoba	$ 241,974	
Saskatchewan	11,035,553	
Alberta	5,434,418	
British Columbia	2,202	
Total advanced		$16,714,147

The advances were secured by interest bearing liens registered against the land of the settlers. From 1876 to 1900 the interest rate was 6%. In 1900 the Government reduced the rate on outstanding advances to 5% and continued this rate on all advances up to 1918. The interest rate on advances from 1919 to 1926 was 7%. The total interest earned to the 15th of March, 1955 amounts to:

Manitoba	$ 143,942	
Saskatchewan	5,221,492	
Alberta	3,071,040	
British Columbia	460	
Total interest earned		$ 8,436,934

The total repayments of Principal and Interest to the 15th of March, 1955, amounts to:

	Principal	*Interest*
Manitoba	$ 196,210	$ 39,050
Saskatchewan	9,523,635	1,950,629
Alberta	3,964,315	783,469
British Columbia	2,177	415
Total repayments	$13,686,337	$ 2,773,563

In 1927 the Federal Government passed an "Act Respecting Certain Debts Due the Crown" under which regulations were established to investigate the unsettled Seed Grain, Fodder and Relief accounts and when warranted to write down the indebtedness. Under this legislation the following amounts have been written off as at the 15th of March, 1955:

	Principal	*Interest*
Manitoba	$ 44,797	$ 103,294
Saskatchewan	869,150	2,026,606
Alberta	1,299,797	1,984,250
British Columbia	25	45
Total amount written off	$ 2,213,769	$ 4,114,195

The balance of the advances and accrued interest to be settled at the 15th of March, 1955, amounts to:

	Principal		*Interest*	
	Federal only	*50-50 with province*	*Federal only*	*50-50 with province*
Manitoba	$ 967	Nil	$ 1,598	Nil
Saskatchewan	357,299	285,468	705,276	538,981
Alberta	71,473	98,834	139,971	163,350
British Columbia	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total outstanding	$429,739	$384,302	$846,845	$702,331

General Information re Seed Grain and Relief Advances

1915 Advances

The early Seed Grain, Fodder and Relief Advances were made to settlers who had not yet received title to their homesteads and pre-emptions. In 1915 the Federal Government agreed to make advances to all Western Farmers who required them. Special Provincial Legislation gave priority to the liens taken for the 1915 advances. Approximately 75% of the total advances were made in 1915.

Joint Advances

In the years 1918 to 1922 the Federal and Provincial Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan entered into Joint Agreements whereby the advances for Fodder and Relief would be shared on a 50-50 basis. The Provincial Government arranged the advance and if it was not repaid within one year the Federal Government paid to the Province 50% of the advance. Collections on these accounts are now split 50% to the Federal and 50% to the Provincial Government.

Seed Grain Advisory Boards

On the authority of "An Act Respecting Certain Debts Due the Crown" Chapter 51 of 1927 statutes the Department has established Regulations approved by the Governor General in Council for investigating individual accounts and where warranted to recommend writing down or writing off an account. Recommendations are made through Seed Grain Advisory Boards established for each Province. The present personnel of the Boards, authorized by Order-in-Council P.C. 3369 of the 23rd of June, 1952, is as follows:

Manitoba—Mr. James Clifford Fuller, Retired Summer 1954 formerly Dist Supt, representing Canada, Mr. Richard Walter Gyles, representing Manitoba;

Saskatchewan—Mr. Edwin Ernest Thomson, Settlement Officer for 5, Regina, Regional Office VLA, representing Canada, Mr. Arthur E. James, representing Saskatchewan;

Alberta—Mr. Harry Allam, District Supt, Edmonton, representing Canada, Mr. John William Judge, representing Alberta.

In addition to this, Mr. C. K. LeCapelain, Chief of the Lands Division is authorized to act in the place of any Federal Member. The Regulations further provide that the Federal Member alone may recommend adjustments for purely Federal Indebtedness.

New Approach to Collections

For many years Departmental practice had been to allow accounts to stand until some property owner wrote to have his account settled. During the last 3 or 4 years two major changes have taken place in this practice:
(1) The outstanding accounts were all reviewed and where there was no security of value the account was written off. Approximately 4,000 worthless accounts were closed out;

(2) Notices have been forwarded to property owners in Manitoba and Saskatchewan inviting them to apply to the Seed Grain Advisory Board for consideration. Many settlements have been made through these notices and many more are under negotiation.

Current Year April 1/54-March 15/55

Cash Received	$ 74,958	$ 8,630	$ 83,588
Write Offs	93,500	308,720	402,220
Total	$168,458	$317,350	$485,808

In Alberta there is a Provincial Seed Grain and Relief Adjustment Board actively following up debts due the Province. Many properties are encumbered by both Federal and Provincial charges and this Board believes more equitable settlements can be made if both accounts are considered at the same time. Our Seed Grain Advisory Board for Alberta is, therefore, working in conjunction with the Collection Supervisor for the Province in these accounts.
Current Year

During the current year 791 accounts have been considered by the Seed Grain Advisory Board and settled. As a result of these settlements payments in the total amount of $83,588 in principal and interest were received and $402,220 of indebtedness was written off.

The approximate number of accounts still outstanding is:

	Federal only	50-50 with province	Total
Manitoba	20	—	20
Saskatchewan	1,550	3,066	4,616
Alberta	373	300	673
British Columbia	—	—	—
Total	1,943	3,366	5,309

Total
(+ accrued interest of $40,489)

	Principal	Interest	Total
Outstanding April 1/54	$982,498	$1,866,527	$2,849,025
Outstanding March 15/55	814,041	1,549,176	2,363,217
By settlement	$168,457	$ 317,351	$ 485,808

Alberta
(+ accrued interest of $8,470)

	Principal	Interest	Total
Outstanding April 1/54	$183,861	$334,086	$517,947
Outstanding March 15/55	170,307	303,321	473,628
By settlement	$ 13,554	$ 30,765	$ 44,319

Saskatchewan
(+ accrued interest of $31,974)

	Principal	Interest	Total
Outstanding April 1/54	$797,478	$1,530,470	$2,327,948
Outstanding March 15/55	642,767	1,244,257	1,887,024
By settlement	$154,711	$ 286,213	$ 440,924

Manitoba
(+ accrued interest of $45)

	Principal	Interest	Total
Outstanding April 1/54	$ 1,159	$ 1,971	$ 3,130
Outstanding March 15/55	967	1,598	2,565
By settlement	$ 192	$ 373	$ 565

	1953-54	1954-55
Settlements during	1170 a/cs	791 a/cs
Cash payments	390	452
a/cs paid in full	10	8

Mr. HARKNESS: These lands have been used for the granting of mining and petroleum leases and things of that sort, have they not?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I give the committee a picture of the activities of the mining and lands division? There is a land and timber section which manages the lands and timber resources on crown lands in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory and Wood Buffalo park under the Territorial Lands Act and regulations, the Northwest Territories Timber Regulations and the Yukon Timber Regulations, and provides liaison on behalf of various federal departments with the agencies concerned in the construction of the Haines-Fairbanks pipeline.

The public lands section manages certain public lands in the provinces which are under the administration of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and administers the Public Lands Grants Act; administers

the seed grain regulations and negotiates settlements of seed grain, fodder, and relief advances made to early settlers in western Canada; maintains files and records pertaining to the federal administration of former dominion lands in the western provinces; maintains a file registration office.

The mineral resources section administers the following acts and regulations pertaining to the mineral resources in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon territory and on certain public lands in the provinces: Northwest Territories Quartz Mining Regulations, Northwest Territories Placer Mining Regulations, Yukon Quartz Mining Act, Yukon Placer Mining Act, Dredging regulations for the Northwest Territories and Yukon territory, Coal mining regulations for the Northwest Territories and Yukon territory, Domestic Coal regulations for the Northwest Territories and Yukon territory, Territorial Quarrying regulations, Northwest Territories Mining Safety Ordinance, Yukon Mining Safety Ordinance, Territorial Oil and Gas Regulations for the Northwest Territories and Yukon territory, order in council P.C. 4300, dated the 31st of August, 1949, and section 57 of the Soldier Settlement Act dealing with the administration of mineral rights under former Soldier Settlement Lands.

Mr. HARKNESS: They seem to have quite a variety of duties in that lands division.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is only a sample of the whole department.

Mr. HENRY: When do we decentralize this? At what point in the development of the north do we give them a degree of local responsibility?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are degrees already. The Yukon is more autonomous than the Northwest Territories. They have a Territorial Council of five elected members, and the Commissioner lives in Whitehorse. In the Northwest Territories they have a Territorial Council which consists of four elected members from the four electoral districts in the Mackenzie District, and five appointed members. The administration is under the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories who is Mr. Robertson, my deputy minister. The other day when we were discussing in the House the resolution to provide amendments to both the Yukon and the Northwest Territories Act I said that our ultimate goal was to provide provincial status for the Yukon territory and also for that part of the Northwest Territories which is the settled portion of the Mackenzie District, but there was a lot of conditions. One of them is implicit in the figures given this morning for the year 1952-53 which, if projected for last year and the current year will show that the revenues that can be derived from these two Territories could not by any means provide for the administration of a province. Another thing is—and I believe I can say this—that the usual process of self-government is that the local people try their hand first at the municipal and school levels, and acquire experience in government and administration. In the whole of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, in spite of the fact that in any given area a school district can be formed by the local residents if they wish to do so, there is only one public school board, and only one separate school board, and they are both in Yellowknife.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am sure you will agree that in the interim before we attain provincial status we should be given greater autonomy.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes, Mr. Simmons. This is a gradual process. Defiinitely I agree. That is why I mentioned, for instance, that the Northwest Territories have not attained the degree of self-government which the Yukon has attained.

Mr. HARDIE: On the municipal level they maintain that the Yukon are still back of them.

Mr. HENRY: I think these two men are well satisfied. It is perfectly apparent we can carry 319.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. HARKNESS: Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, there are several things here. I notice that this is the big revenue-producing item. The revenues are nearly 2½ times the expenditures for last year. Where do these revenues come from?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: From the operation of the Acts and regulations I have just mentioned; I believe I can give you a breakdown, if that is what you wish, Mr. Harkness.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The forecast for revenue for 1955-56 is as follows:

Public Lands	
Rentals	
Royalties	
Sales	
Bonus for leases	
Sundry fees	
Interest on seed grain accounts	$ 452,000
Territorial Lands	
(a) Northwest Territories	
Rentals	
Royalties	
Sales	
Mining fees	
Perquisites	
Timber dues	
Forfeitures	
Sundry fees	
Sundry sales	$ 407,000
(b) Yukon Territory	
Rentals	
Sales	
Royalties	
Mining fees	
Sundry fees	
Timber dues	
Perquisites	
Miscellaneous	$ 215,600
Grand total of revenue for 1955-56	$ 1,074,600

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you this broken down for the amount that comes from mining?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: And for the amount from petroleum and the amount from forests?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mining fees in the Northwest Territories—$102,000.

Timber dues in the Northwest Territories	60,000
Mining fees in the Yukon Territory	90,000
Timber dues in the Yukon Territory	42,000

Mr. HARKNESS: What about petroleum and natural gas rights?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The revenue to date on petroleum and natural gas this year, up to the 28th of March 1955, for the current year 1954-55, in the Northwest Territories is $301,416.35.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, it is the biggest item. I should like to get the proportion between them.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Yukon it is $4,421; in the provinces it is $320,688.49, on lands which we own. The total for oil and gas this year, which has been a good year, is $626,525.84.

Mr. HARKNESS: That means that more—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am sorry. These are the estimates for this current year. I can tell you that these current year estimates as compared with the ones I have given for 1955-56 are $40,000 less for public lands across Canada, $30,000 for the Northwest Territories, and $20,000 less for the Yukon Territory.

Mr. HARKNESS: You have a total of $976,000 revenue, and apparently $600,000 of that is from petroleum and natural gas rights.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. The total revenues for the present year 1954-55 are estimated at $977,123, and of this, as you see, the actual revenue up to the 28th of March, 1955, from oil and gas is $626,000.

Mr. SIMMONS: I should like to ask the minister whether any steps have been taken to strengthen the staff of the Lands Office at Whitehorse? It seems to me that they have been under-staffed for some time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I shall have to ask one of our officials. That is a detail with which I am not conversant.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: We have done that, Mr. Chairman. We have added several to the staff. Mr. Lecapelain can give details.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: For next year, there is one position for a draughtsman, and we are transferring one position from Ottawa to there. He leaves here on the 5th of April, and we are transferring a position from Yellowknife to Whitehorse.

Mr. SIMMONS: There is a case again of what I brought up the other day, in regard to sending officials from Ottawa to fill those jobs. Here is one going to the Northwest Territories.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are transfers of civil servants. That is only normal.

Mr. SIMMONS: Why do they not call for applications up there?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: The stenographic position is just a transfer, and it will be filled locally, but the clerk; grade 4, requires a transfer of a person. The Treasury would not allow us a new position. The best we could do was to transfer a position from Ottawa. We did not have a vacant position. There will be a new draughtsman position and there should be a competition.

Mr. HELLYER: That should please Mr. Thatcher.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, a transfer from Ottawa to the north.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the position when natural gas rights are given out. Is it the same as in Alberta?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: In the provinces we call for tenders in the same way as in Alberta. The highest bidder gets it. We hold those about once a month for provincial land. They pay a royalty of twelve and a half per cent. They also give us a bonus for the right to explore and drill. That is done by open competition. In the Territories so far we have only had six leases, for Imperial Oil at Norman Wells. In the southwest part of the Northwest Territories and adjoining parts of the Yukon, we have two hundred and fifty exploratory permits. The first one who comes to the office of the department in Ottawa

files on the land for the right to explore. He is given an exploratory permit at a $250 fee for each permit for a grid area of approximately ninety square miles—between ninety and one hundred square miles depending on the location. They must make a deposit of fice cents per acre to ensure that they will spend five cents an acre within the first eighteen months of exploratory work. If they do not spend that they forfeit that money. In the second eighteen months, they must spend twenty-five cents an acre on exploratory work. They make a deposit with the government of a similar amount, and, if they do not spend that, they forfeit that money. In the fourth year they must spend thirty cents an acre, the next year forty cents an acre, the next year fifty cents an acre on exploratory work. If at any time they find oil or gas in an exploration, they must take out a lease, and they pay us a royalty of 12½ per cent plus a rental for the land. In the Northwest Territories they do not pay a bonus for their rights. That is a little extra incentive. We are anxious to get them to go and explore. So it is a little easier than in the Yukon territory.

Mr. SIMMONS: May I ask Mr. Lecapelain how many leases there are in the Yukon territory.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Two hundred and fifty leases in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. They have forty in the Yukon. We have two oil and gas concessions in a remote area for the Peel Plateau Oil Company. They are each 4.800 square miles. They were called by tender. The company that would spend the most money on exploratory work in this remote area got it, and the company placed a deposit with the department, which will be forfeited if they have not spent the money. We know that they have spent far more than that on exploration work. They must give us copies of all their geological findings.

Mr. SIMMONS: Peel River Plateau?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes, and Eagle Plain.

Mr. SIMMONS: Last week I mentioned to the committee that consideration should be given to the possibility of constructing a road from Dawson or Mayo into the Mackenzie delta around Fort McPherson. Now a proposed road in that direction would tap that area, would it not?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes, the company has made a survey for a road leading from Dawson northeast. I understand that it is a very good route, and it would go to the Peel Plateau area.

Mr. SIMMONS: It would be the shortest route from the Mackenzie to the tide-water, and Skagway, around Dawson?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes, I have studied the map for many years, and that was my location for a road.

Mr. SIMMONS: It would also serve the D.E.W. line?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: That would be the route for a road from the Mackenzie delta down through that area to the Alaska Highway.

Mr. SIMMONS: There are several known deposits of iron ore in the area which this road would also traverse, is that not so?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: It is a very promising area for minerals. A little to the west they found a very favourable deposit of silver-lead-zinc last fall. Though they have not found an iron deposit, there is a good deal of iron float and many geologists are out looking for it. There is very good iron float but they have not found a deposit yet.

Mr. SIMMONS: I understand that they have recently found it.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: That is news to us.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is twenty-five to one. I move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: You, Mr. Harkness, brought up some questions still undealt with?

Mr. HARKNESS: I brought up the question of forests some time ago, and I did refer to this item at that time. Perhaps I could get an answer on that afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall adjourn, to meet at 3.30.

AFTERNOON SITTING

3.30 p.m.
MARCH 29, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we shall proceed with item 313.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There was a question on this, I believe.

Mr. HARKNESS: I was asking about the various resources which were in the northern territories—I think it was some time this morning—and there was going to be an answer given.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. C. K. LECAPELAIN: (*Chief, Lands Division*): Mr. Chairman, for the past several years we have been conducting surveys to find out more about our forest resources in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon. First of all, the foresters in Ottawa study aerial photographs and decide where there is likely to be commercial timber. Then we send out the forest inventory survey teams. They worked in the Northwest Territories during the years 1949, 1950 and 1951, and in the Yukon territory in 1952, 1953 and 1954. Next year they are going to make an inventory of the timber in the Northwest Territories in the Liard river valley from the 60th parallel to Fort Simpson and then in Wood Buffalo Park. During the course of these surveys, aerial photographs are made and studied, and from them the amount of timber is estimated. These are some of the results:

In Peace River, from the mouth of the river to a point 150 miles up stream there are 1,800,000 feet b.m. That is beautiful spruce timber. The greater part of it is mature, and they tell me that some of the trees measure 180 feet tall. I do not think you have anything in Ontario which is as tall as that. Down the Slave river from Fort Smith to Great Slave Lake there is an estimated 84,720,000 f.b.m.—timber which they have been cutting for years, in isolated patches. However, there is a good stand of timber left there, but it is not in big stands. Down the Mackenzie river from Fort Providence to Norman Wells there is another 206 million feet. This again is in scattered stands, mostly at the southern end. There is also some good timber in the Liard river valley from Fort Simpson to the British Columbia boundary. We are going to have a survey made of that this summer, and also of some timber inside Wood Buffalo park. In the Yukon Territory, along the Stewart river, we estimate there is 359 million feet b.m.; on the McQuesten river 39 million feet handy to the Elsa camp. There is an excellent stand of timber up on the Nisutlin. Last year they carried out a survey up the head waters of the Liard at Watson lake. There is other scattered timber up on the Snag river and the Pelly river. Those are the main stands.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is plenty of timber there which is sufficiently near to water that it can be got out rapidly and which would take care of all the foreseeable building in this north country.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes sir, for a long time.

Mr. SIMMONS: The only thing is that the lumber up there checks very badly. The shrinkage is heavy and they use it just for rough wood. They bring in a lot of wood to finish the job.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: That is Yukon Territory timber. They bring in the best selected timber from Vancouver.

Mr. HARKNESS: In the Yukon the problem as I see it is not so serious as it is in the Northwest Territories because entry into and an exit from the Yukon is easier and cheaper than in the case of the Northwest Territories.

An Hon. MEMBER: Not much cheaper.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Timber on the Peace river amounts to 1,800,000 feet of splendid spruce, and that will not check. That is as good as you will get anywhere. We are anxious to have it cut because a lot of it is mature and we will lose it if we do not cut it in the next 40 years.

Mr. SIMMONS: May I ask what is the rate of the timber duties in the Yukon.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Dry cord wood is 50 cents a cord, and green timber, is $1 a cord. Saw timber is, for poplar, $2 a thousand f.b.m. and other species; spruce is $5 a thousand.

Mr. HARKNESS: Are those the standard charges?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Those are the standard charges.

Mr. SIMMONS: Are those new rates?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS: What changes have been made?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: The change was in the green timber. It was 50 cents a cord for both green and dry and they raised the green timber to $1 a cord and the saw logs, I think it was $3 a thousand, and they raised it to $5.

Mr. SIMMONS: Does this not penalize the small operator in that country, Mr. Minister?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Those dues have been on there for many years. They were on when cord wood was selling at $8 a cord in Whitehorse, and now they are getting $25. The dues for saw logs, $3, have been on there for 50 years without change since you could buy saw timber for $25 or $30 a thousand. They are now getting $100 a thousand, sometimes more, so it was felt that with the increased costs of administration which have certainly gone up in the last 50 years—most of the operators would be making more money when prices increased—that they should make a little contribution towards the cost of administration.

The CHAIRMAN: When was the change made Mr. LeCapelain?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: The first of January last year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: How do these figures compare with the adjoining provinces?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: They are very similar to Alberta. Alberta, adjoining, is higher. In the Northwest Territories it is a little less.

Mr. HARKNESS: Less than what?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Less than Alberta. In Wood Buffalo Park we sell timber for $6 a thousand and it is $5 a thousand in the Northwest Territories.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: How are the Yukon rates, compared with British Columbia?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: British Columbia I think is less. They are a little hard to figure out, but I think they would be less.

Mr. HARDIE: When you say the timber dues is for the cord 50 cents for dry and $1 a cord for green is that fire wood?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes.

Mr. HARDIE: Is that charged to the natives?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: No. To the natives it is always free timber.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The charge is to the operators?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: To the commercial operators or to white persons, or half-breeds working at a job. Not nomads, but people working at a job in Fort Smith in an established home.

Mr. HARDIE: If a man holds a trapping licence, he does not pay, is that right?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: How much lumber was produced in the Northwest Territories last year?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Would you like the figures for this year? I have them here. For the Northwest Territories the cut was just under 2 million feet this fiscal year, and in Wood Buffalo Park 4 million feet. The revenue in the Northwest Territories was $30,640, and the revenue in Wood Buffalo Park was $24,000. In the Yukon Territory the revnue was $32,000.

Something was mentioned this morning about the wardens. In addition to their game duties and fire protection duties, they administer this timber for us. They issue the permits and inspect operaions to see that they cut according to the regulations and do not waste too much timber and cut it properly and so on; so the wardens perform three functions.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there any coal in the north where it could be used?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: There is lots of coal, sir. In the Yukon territory and they are mining now just across the river from Carmacks. There is plenty of coal there. That is the only place where it is being mined. There is lots of coal in other areas closer to Whitehorse than Carmacks. There is coal at Dawson. There is coal south of Whitehorse. In the Northwest Territories there is coal at various places, but it is only being mined in a small way at two places. Down below Aklavik, there is just a little operation on the west channel at the mouth of the Mackenzie river, and also on Baffin island there are two domestic operations.

Mr. MICHENER: What kind of coal is it?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Sub-bituminous.

Mr. MICHENER: Soft coal?

Mr. LECAPELAIN: Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS: Three years ago when I was at Aklavik, at the back of the hotel they had two cubic yards of gravel and I asked them what it cost to put that gravel there. It came to $75 a cubic yard.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In Aklavik?

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is one of the reasons for the move.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: That gravel was brought from Arctic Red river.

Mr. SIMMONS: This came from Herschel Island.

Mr. LECAPELAIN: There is no gravel at Aklavik. The nearest is actually across the muskeg and across the channel to the west or the east, but the most convenient way by water is to bring it downstream from Arctic Red river about 100 miles. It has to be loaded and unloaded by hand. If I had heard it cost $100 I would not be surprised.

Mr. HARDIE: Has the minister given any consideration to the use of coal in the new townsite at Aklavik?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, this is being considered because of the proximity of the coal mine on the west bank of the Delta.

Mr. HARDIE: Have they to your knowledge done any surveys?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a survey team going in this summer, I am informed.

Mr. SIMMONS: What do you contemplate using for heating the new hospital?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not think it has been designed yet. The plans are prepared by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. HELLYER: What is the major source of heat in Aklavik now?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Fuel oil from Norman Wells brought by boat.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask a question about mining regulations. I suppose it would come under this item?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You know that in the Yukon they have the Quartz Mining Act, and in The Northwest territories it is the Quartz Mining regulations.

Mr. MICHENER: Could the minister explain what is the difference between the two, and what the government's policy is with regard to mining in these two areas?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Two years ago there was a resolution on the order paper to amend the Territorial Lands Act to provide for the repeal of the Yukon Quartz Mining Act, and provide that mining would be governed by regulations in the Yukon, which would be similar to the regulations which applied to the Northwest Territories. That could not be proceeded with at that session. Last year after I came to the department, I put the same resolution on the order paper. It was passed, and the bill to amend the Territorial Lands Act got its first reading. Then I received protests from the Yukon and especially from the member for the Yukon in the House of Commons, Mr. Simmons, and also from the British Columbia and Yukon Chambers of Mines, and various interested parties. I do not know whether members of the committee wish me to go into the details of the transactions which we had at that time because I intend to bring in this session a new Yukon Quartz Mining Act, if I feel there will be time; and if we reach that point, I will give an explanation in the House of the dealings I have had. To keep an Act for the Yukon is my present intention.

Mr. MICHENER: As to the content of the Act, is it the intention to assimilate regulations governing the security of claims in the two areas?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would be our intention that they should be similar to the extent that it is possible, bearing in mind the difference in terrain and also the fact that you have in the Yukon a number of individual prospectors, which you do not have to such an extent in the Northwest Territories. I am just mentioning this. I do not want to get into an argument about this because we could go on arguing for hours. I am not arguing at all. I am giving to Mr. Michener a statement of facts. Nobody knows except myself and my officials the exact provisions that will be in this new Yukon Quartz Mining Act. We are doing our best to try to protect the interests of the small prospector in this Act, and to take into account the difference in pattern which exists between the Yukon topography and the topography of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Simmons. The Yukon Chamber of Mines has been, and is still making representations as to what should be included in that Act, and the matter is still under consideration. I am still discussing this with my officials and with the law officers of the Crown. I am deciding what the

contents of the bill should be, and really I do not believe we would be serving any useful purpose by having a discussion at the present time, which, of course, I cannot do while the bill is in the hands of the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. MICHENER: But I take it it is still settled policy that the Yukon will be governed by a statute rather than by regulations which are announced?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There will be an Act, but there will be regulations accompanying the Act, which regulations will be limited to procedure.

Mr. MICHENER: So that the changes to be made by the regulations will be procedural rather than substantive?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: All procedural. We have seen to it that the regulations which would be passed under the Act would be strictly procedural.

Mr. SIMMONS: Just what items would be procedural?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am not at liberty to say, Mr. Simmons, before the bill is presented to the House.

Mr. SIMMONS: I would like to mention to Mr. Michener that prior to 1924 we had regulations up in the Yukon and they were not satisfactory at all with the result that when Mr. George Black was the member here for the Yukon the government let him bring in a Yukon Act, and that Act, I may say, has worked to the satisfaction of the mining fraternity and everyone else in the Yukon ever since, and I do not see any reason to change it at all. I shall have a lot to say about this when it comes up, but I will abide by the minister's wish now and keep quiet. We do not want regulations in that country at all. We want the stability of an Act. We do not want the flexibility of regulations.

Mr. MICHENER: I have worked in the Yukon and in Northwest Territories from time to time and it seems to me that they have been constant over the years. Have there been any important changes in the regulations?

Mr. C. W. JACKSON (*Assistant Deputy Minister*): There have been several amendments made to the Northwest Territories regulations by order of the Governor in Council, but they deal, more or less, with special cases.

An Hon. MEMBER: Mostly made in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Natural resources are the responsibility of the federal government. The order is made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SIMMONS: Only two or three would like to see regulations, and change our method, and it would be detrimental to the mining industry. It is all right for some of these interests in Toronto to come up here and have things changed to their satisfaction against the wishes of the people up there, but they are going to have a hard time getting away with it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You see, there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. HARKNESS: The regulations in the case of the Northwest Territories differ considerably from those in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As things stand now, the regulations in the Northwest Territories are fundamentally different.

Mr. HARDIE: But they still come under the Territorial Lands Act?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Under the Quartz Mining Act in the Yukon.

Mr. HARDIE: Under the Act.

Mr. MICHENER: It should be remembered that mining is a new industry in the Northwest Territories compared with the Yukon. The administration in both areas I take it is a matter for this department.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Surely.

Mr. MICHENER: You have a centralized registration here, and you have local registration?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would it not be in the interests of all concerned if the same Act applied both to the Yukon and to the Northwest Territories?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has just said that this matter is under consideration. Why should we try to debate it now. You are asking for something—I am sure you will prevent Mr. Simmons from leaving in a happy state of mind.

Mr. SIMMONS: Why did you not let me go?

Mr. HARKNESS: I was only asking for information.

The CHAIRMAN: If you are asking for information from the minister, you might get some from Mr. Simmons too.

Mr. SIMMONS: I will undertake to give you the whole story.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry the item?

Mr. THATCHER: Carried, as long as Mr. Simmons is not blaming anything on Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried then, subject to that reservation.

Mr. THATCHER: Would this be the proper time to move my motion now we have finished Northern Affairs?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, we will vote on your motion. We are back to item 312.

Mr. THATCHER: I have given this matter a great deal of thought and I have tried to word the motion in a manner which the minister might accept. As I say, I have given this subject a great deal of thought but I do not want to withdraw my present motion until I make sure that the minister will accept the new one which I have prepared.

The CHAIRMAN: You have got to say first whether you are going to withdraw this one or not before you can submit another.

Mr. THATCHER: Then how will I know?

The CHAIRMAN: You will have to take a chance on that.

Mr. THATCHER: Of course, I can always move this one afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want a vote on this?

Mr. THATCHER: Yes. Can I speak on it once?

An Hon. MEMBER: You have said enough already.

Mr. THATCHER: I think everybody in the building receives in his mail this Soviet News Bulletin—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I never thought that that would impress you, Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. THATCHER: I do not think anyone would accuse me of being a communist, but I think at the same time that if we can learn anything from them we should do it. I will admit at the start that this is probably just communist propaganda, but nevertheless they have got something on Arctic development in the latest issue which I think I will read to members of the committee since it will only take me perhaps 60 seconds to read the few paragraphs which

I have in mind. I will put them on the record. This relates to the latest town they have established in the Arctic. It is headed: "New town beyond Arctic Circle." And it says:

> Up until 15 years ago or so the district on the Taimir Peninsula where the town of Norilsk now stands was known only for its fur-bearing animals and firsh resources. But then the roar of motors broke the Arctic stillness near the 70th parallel as Soviet builders came with bull-dozers, excavators and trucks to lay out a new town there. Norilsk has expanded greatly in the years since then.

I would like to point out that that is further north than almost all our territories are.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is Aklavik.

Mr. THATCHER: I will continue the quotation:

> In these four years new housing with a total of 129,000 square meters of floorspace has been built and turned over for occupancy. Large, handsome buildings have been put up. About 15,000,000 rubles has been spent on town improvements in the past four years. All the streets and sidewalks have been asphalted. During the polar night, which lasts more than two months here, the city is flooded with electric light from the attractive lamps that have been set up in all the streets.
>
> The 14 schools are housed in spacious and convenient buildings.
>
> About two and a half thousand young men and women attend the local evening and secondary technical schools.
>
> There are about 40 kindergartens and children's nurseries. A number of the local factories and schools have outfitted rooms...
>
> There are now more than 400 schoolteachers and a similar number of doctors and trained nurses in Norilsk.
>
> The town's libraries have a total of about a million books.
>
> We are building a Palace of Culture, a music school, another movie house and an indoor swimming pool. A TV station is also on the program.
>
> The town has 13 splendidly equipped gyms.

I do not question, Mr. Chairman, that this may be propaganda. The only point I am trying to make is that the Russians are doing something in the Arctic which maybe we could take a lesson from, and if we can I do not see that we should be so reticent as not to look at the improvements which they have made.

Mr. SIMMONS: In a few years time they will be taking a lesson from the Northwest and Yukon.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: They may have started in 1953.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you change the figures which you have there and reduce them, you have exactly what we are doing for Aklavik. We are building a new town in Aklavik, the same as this Norislk. We are building a new town, putting in a sewer and water system, building streets, building homes, building a hospital, building schools for the children—just change the figures which you have for this town of Norilsk and put in the figures for the population of Aklavik and you have exactly what we are doing in Aklavik. This is also on the 70th parallel.

Mr. THATCHER: The Russians have 50 cities more than 50,000 people, by building towns by this method on a planned basis. I am not deprecating what you are doing at all. I welcome it, and I am glad about it. What I am saying is that there might be a lesson to learn from this.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are doing the same for Aklavik without getting any lessons from the Russians.

Mr. THATCHER: The population figure bears out the contention that not very much has been done up to this point.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I agree. I have explained to you time and time again that there was no pressure for population in the north. In Russia, apart from the slave labour which was sent to Siberia, there was an acute and important necessity for them to exploit the natural resources of the north in climatic conditions which are often easier than ours for the same parallels.

Mr. THATCHER: Of course, we will not agree.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, we will not agree on this. You want to blame the department on the estimates of this year.

Mr. THATCHER: You did not hear my second motion.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I could not. You did not read it.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a motion of Mr. Thatcher's seconded by Mr. Yuill. It has been read a couple of times.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would you mind reading it again.

The CHAIRMAN:

> —Whereas the Department of Northern Affairs appears to have no aggressive policy of developing or populating the Northwest Territories or the Yukon—and Whereas our population in those areas has shown little or no growth in recent years—and Whereas Canada's Northland economic development is lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries such as Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway.
>
> Therefore be it resolved that this committee recommends to parliament that consideration should be given to the advisability of enlarging and expanding the Department of Northern Affairs for the specific purpose of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

The CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of that motion will please raise their hands.

The motion is lost.

Mr. THATCHER: Now, Mr. Chairman, may I move my second motion?

The CHAIRMAN: If it is not exactly the same as this.

Mr. THATCHER: I was just trying to make it acceptable to the minister.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Have you a copy there?

Mr. THATCHER: I will read it. I have deleted the first paragraph, and I start on the second.

"Whereas the population in Canada's north has shown little growth in recent years and Whereas Canada's economic development would appear to be lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries such as Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway.

Therefore be it resolved that this committee recommends to parliament that consideration should be given to the advisability of enlarging and expanding the nation's program of opening up, developing and populating the Northwest Territories and the Yukon."

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You say that "economic development would appear to be lagging". You say: "Whereas Canada's economic development would appear to be lagging far behind that of other Arctic countries". I do not agree with that. I believe Canada's economy is much more prosperous than that of Russia or any of the countries mentioned here.

Mr. THATCHER: Not the economic development in the north.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is not what it says.

An Hon. MEMBER: Carelessly drafted.

Mr. HABEL: Would you favour having our unemployed sent up north as the Russians are doing, Mr. Thatcher?

Mr. THATCHER: No. I will withdraw my motion if the minister will not accept it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you accept yourself the statement that Canada's economy is lagging behind Russia's?

Mr. THATCHER: You are interested in Northern development, I am sure, and it seemed to me that that might strengthen your hand. However—

The CHAIRMAN: Then we are on the National Parks branch. It seems to me we shall make more orderly progress in that if I call specific sections. Any particular point can be covered as we go through them.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We were on votes 296 and 297, and in dealing with these votes we have finished with the Historic Sites and with National Parks Trunk highways. I suggest that at this time I give a list of construction projects which are in the estimates for each national park, and after I have given that list for a particular park we could open general questions on that park. Would that suit the convenience of members of the committee?

Mr. HARKNESS: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For Banff National park the amount of construction and building proposed for this year is $549,800. I will give a list of the important projects.

Reconstruction of East Approach Road, Minnewanka Junction to edge of townsite—10,000 lineal feet ..	$192,000
Construction of public comfort station in the vicinity of Cave and Basin Bathhouse	9,500
Construction of public comfort station in Central Park	21,000
Ski Jump—Mount Norquay	100,000
Replacement of two kitchen shelters and extension of sewer system—Tunnel Mountain Campground	11,300
Commencement of reconstruction of the Upper Hot Springs Road	25,000
Continuation of the construction of Trailer Park—Tunnel Mountain Campground	50,000
Continuation of reconstruction of Mount Norquay Road	25,000
Sanitation cutting of timber and operation of sawmill	20,000
Construction of seven miles of fire road from mile 103.5 on Saskatchewan River to and up Alexander River	16,500

In addition there is a long list of small items in amounts below $8,000.

Mr. MICHENER: I see a sum of $665,240 on page 405 of the Estimates. Is that the item?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is it. It includes the purchase of equipment.

Mr. HARKNESS: $580,000 of this is for construction.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: $549,000 some $100,000 is for the purchase of equipment.

Mr. MICHENER: I would have thought that there were ski jumps in those mountains without having to construct a new one for $100,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have to have a ski jump, and we want to have one up to Olympic standards because we hope to have the international ski competition in Banff, and we are making a bid to have the winter Olympics in 1960, and so this jump will be built according to International Association standards and to Olympic standards. You see, Mount Norquay is I believe, the only place in the world where you can have all the elements of an international ski tournament, including the slalom, downhill, cross-country and jumps. You can have all four at the same place at Mount Norquay. We hope to have, with this new jump, a large scale development up there.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: With whom do you file your application for the games?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe we file an application. There is a representative Olympic body in Canada.

Mr. HELLYER: That old ski jump is beyond repair.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It has collapsed.

Mr. HELLYER: It looked as if it was going to.

Mr. MICHENER: Was that built by the department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: How much did it cost?

Mr. HUTCHISON: I think it was a relief project built of native timber. It must have been up 25 years or more.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is this new jump being built on the same site as the old one?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Of course it may be a few feet away.

Mr. HARKNESS: Of what type of construction is it?

Mr. HUTCHISON: It is a natural hill for the jump and it will be cut and filled for the run-in. The take-off will be trestle.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is really a bulldozing job, plus building the trestle.

Mr. HUTCHISON: It will mean excavation from an area approximately a quarter of a mile away, and we shall fill in.

Mr. HARKNESS: That will account for the cost, to a large extent I presume.

Mr. MICHENER: Was it not possible to find a natural jump?

Mr. HUTCHISON: I think this is about as close to a natural slope as we could get, and now it has got to be modified to meet F.I.S. and Olympic standards.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by F.I.S.?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Federation Internationale du Ski.

Mr. MICHENER: Is any record kept of the number of people who come for this one sport as distinct from other visitors?

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry item 297?

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not see anything here for any further skiing or hiking trails—a matter which I have been taking up for the last 10 years in the House. Has anything further been done or any plans made in connection with that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There does not seem to be the demand for it which I thought last year existed when you talked about it. I was there, and I talked with people who were interested in skiing in and around Banff and district and I inquired especially whether there was a need for more ski trails, and all the people who are interested in skiing up there told me that there was no need for them.

Mr. HARKNESS: The people who do the skiing there do not usually live in Banff. A very large proportion come from outside places.

Mr. HELLYER: Such as Calgary.

Mr. HARKNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What pressure we experienced was for better slopes, ski hauls and things like that.

Mr. CANNON: I have found out over the last few years that there has been a trend to skiing at places where there are lifts and the old trails are not so popular.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That agrees with the kind of representations I get.

Mr. CANNON: I do a lot of skiing myself, but only on hills where there are lifts.

An Hon. MEMBER: Good luck.

Mr. HARKNESS: If you are going to consult only the people of Banff you are going to get the advice most profitable to the people who live in Banff. That is only natural. If that advice had always been followed out, you would not have had any other ski development except the one at Mount Norquay.

Mr. MCLEOD: If you carry this item are you passing up all the others?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh no, I am coming to Elk Island national park.

Mr. MCLEOD: I want to say a few words when we come to Revelstoke.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am taking this park by park for that reason.

Mr. HELLYER: I should say that during a visit I made to Banff National park last year, I found the facilities there were very excellent. The new park behind the administrative building in particular was just beautiful, and provided facilities which were really attractive, and which the tourists enjoyed very much. All in all I think the administration and the department should be highly commended for the work they have done.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Cape Breton Highlands National park, $31,500.

Continuation of construction of fire roads in the interior of the park	$ 7,500
Improvements and extension to the industrial compound area at Ingonish	6,600
Construction of five parking area lookouts on the Cabot Trail	4,000
Reconstruction of the roads to Franey Mountain and French Mountain fire towers	4,620

There are a few other items of $2,500 or less.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any question on that?

Mr. MICHENER: How much of the Cabot trail—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We discussed that on the parks truck highways primary, but I will give you the answer.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose there would be quite a bit more travel there now.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Continuation of the paving of the Cabot trail, approximately 15 miles, $300,000.

Widening certain sections of the Cabot Trail between MacKenzie Mountain and Corney Brook	$23,540
Construction of steel flex-beam guard-rail on hazardous curves, bridge approaches and fills from park headquarters to Neil's Harbour (Cabot Trail)	23,430

Mr. MICHENER: Is that Cabot Trail all federal department road?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, part of it is provincial.

Mr. JACKSON: Approximately 20 miles of the northern section is in the province.

Mr. MICHENER: Are the two parts being kept in comparable condition?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Last year when some tenders were asked for some paving, they were asked for jointly, and this year I am in correspondence with the Minister of Highways of Nova Scotia in order to do the same thing.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, that should be a good scenic territory for tourists this year.

Mr. HELLYER: Does the minister realize that in widening this road and putting up guard-rails he is limiting to a great extent all the suspense and challenge which used to be associated with this road?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have never travelled the Cabot trail, but I will this year.

Mr. MACEACHEN: The minister would have to build a great many guard-rails and do a great deal of widening before he limits the excitement of the trail, because despite the improvements made there travelling the trail is still a very exciting experience, and many people turn back.

Mr. HELLYER: It is not a good road for beginners.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Is there any reason for the reduction in the number of visitors?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We could blame it on the weather I suppose. You are on the annual report, and those are the figures for 1953-54. For 1954-55 they are not complete yet. Cape Breton Highlands had 35,372 visitors in 1952-53, and 33,610 in 1953-54. I am informed that in previous years there was no check of the visitors to Cape Breton Highlands made at all entrances to the park. This year there has been a check at all entrances, and the number of visitors, according to the check made this year, was approximately 123,741.

Now may I give a list of the projects at Elk Island park.

Construction of one duplex staff residence	$27,000
Construction of road through beach area and filling parking area	31,000
Construction of warden's cabin at Oster Lake	14,000
Installation of electric power line to south end buildings and south gate buildings and floodlighting of south gate entrance	5,000
Improvements to western entrance	8,000

In addition there are a number of other items of $2,500 and less.

Mr. HARDIE: Have you any record of the number of visitors during the season?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, at Elk Island the number of visitors last year—in 1953-54—was 177,482. In 1954-55 up to the 31st of January, the number of visitors had been 151,200.

Mr. HARDIE: We can take it it will be about the same?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. Between the 31st of January and April you would not have many visitors to Elk Island Park, but I know for sure that the weather had a lot to do with the number of visitors to the park. It is a place where families will go for picnic purposes on Sundays. Around Edmonton last summer, the weather was not very good.

Mr. HARDIE: I was out there last summer myself and I found that particularly at week-ends there is a large number of people there from Edmonton and the surrounding countryside, particularly families who cannot get away to the more luxurious park at Jasper. They go to Elk Island. But the water there, and the swimming facilities, are deplorable, and I was wondering whether the minister or his department had considered putting in a swimming pool. I do not think they could do much about the water as it is. 177,000 people visit the park in season, and that is a fairly substantial number of people to visit a small park.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There were quite a lot of people swimming when I was there on a Sunday afternoon, despite the fact that it was pretty cold that Sunday. This park is principally an animal preserve and a picnic ground.

Mr. HARDIE: What is the revenue from Elk Island Park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is difficult to tell you what the revenue is exactly at each of these national parks because you can purchase a ticket for all the mountain parks for the whole season. You might purchase it at Banff and go to Banff only once, but come to Elk Island five or six times a year. But according to the figures we have, the revenue from April 1 to Decemebr 31, 1954, is $18,342, which does not go very far towards providing a swimming pool which usually costs $300,000.

Mr. HARDIE: Maybe you could raise the rates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe you could discuss that matter with Mr. Decore.

Mr. HELLYER: I do not think a swimming pool would be a good investment, because you are catering, 95 per cent, to the people of Edmonton. They have all kinds of swimming pools there. They go for a basket picnic and to have an outing and get out to the water. The beach is terrible from the point of view of bathing, I know, but I do not think a swimming pool would be a good idea.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Funday National Park, $61,000 total.

Reconstruction of part of the Point Wolfe Road to the Point Wolfe River	$10,000
Completion of construction of Forty Five Road	10,000
Completion of construction of the Shepody Road	10,000

There are also a number of expenditures of $4,500 and less.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, I note a reference to road Forty Five. Is that the road from the main road to the park?

Mr. HUTCHISON: The Forty Five road is on the boundary of the park. It runs from Alma and joins the old Shepody road on the north boundary of the park.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: What about the road from the main road to the park? Is that the responsibility of the federal government or of the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Within the park it is our responsibility. Outside the park it is a provincial responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Georgian Bay Islands $33,000.

Construction of warden's residence on Beasoleil Island	$20,500
Construction of combined workshop and storage building	8,500
Improving existing trails for truck travel and development of fire trails	4,000

Mr. HARKNESS: Is this a park where people have summer cottages? What sort of a park is it?

Mr. HUTCHISON: It is a recreation park. There are no summer cottages. To a large extent use is made of the park, and of the island by groups of youths, so you have camps for Y.M.C.A. groups and church groups.

Mr. HARKNESS: This is a camping proposition, really. People can only get out by boat, I presume?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Glacier National Park. As I said the other day, there are no roads to this park. It can be reached only by rail, and the only expenditure this year is $4,000 for the continuation of a fire trail.

Mr. YUILL: I will "double up" two parks. Just as the minister said, there is no road into Glacier park. Has any consideration been given to the construction of a road which would connect Mount Revelstoke and Glacier? That would be a good road for summer use, and it would also be a link in the road from Revelstoke boulder.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If the province is interested in building a road there it is the responsibility of the province. The road from Revelstoke park to Glacier park would be outside the two parks and consequently it would be definitely the responsibility of the province.

Mr. YUILL: I am well aware of that. I was wanting to find out if your officials had any information as to the possibility of constructing such a road.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The engineers in charge of the construction of trunk roads are the engineers of the Department of Public Works, not ours as I explained the other day. I have no information, and I am looking at my officials and they do not seem to have any information either.

Mr. YUILL: Then, I guess, that will remain unanswered.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Jasper National Park, $97,000.

Replacement of incinerator, Jasper townsite	$20,000
Installation of ventilating system in Quonset 40, garage	5,500
Sanitation cutting and sawmill operations	20,000
Replacement of headquarters warden's cabin—Whirlpool district	18,000

There are also a number of other items of $4,500 and less.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Chairman, there is an interesting statement on page 34 which is repeated on 39. It is not very serious, but I would like to know what it means. The statement is this: "Additional accommodation for visitors was provided by private enterprise in the park." And on page 39 we read: "Additional tourist accommodation was provided in several parks by private enterprise." Would this be counting the C.N.R. as in any sense private enterprise? There must be more to it than that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As far as our department is concerned, the C.N.R. is private enterprise.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Does this mean that private enterprise has a right to build in the national parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If private enterprise is interested in building accommodation in the parks and if the site is, according to the department, a suitable place, it is given as a concession, and tenders are asked for by public notice.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Subject of course to control and approval of the architecture and plans.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of course. Kootenay National Park.

Continuation of the development of new industrial compound at McKay Creek including a stores building and workshops	$85,000
Continuation of the development of the western entrance area, construction of staff quarters and office building	33,000
Replacement of warden's cabin at Marble Canyon	$17,500

Mr. MICHENER: Would the waters in this park be affected by the works which are the subject of the bill which has been debated in the House recently? Are the Arrow lakes in this park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. It is the Sinclair creek.

Mr. MICHENER: The levels of the water do not affect the park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, not in the park.

Mr. HELLYER: Who is accommodated by the warden's cabins?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The warden and his family, and he has a small office in the cabin.

Mr. HELLYER: Do you find that building costs are particularly high in the park? Do you think you have a pretty reasonably priced cabin, and that you should be able to get a cabin for $17,000?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: According to my information it would cost around $13,000 to build the same type of accommodation which costs there about $17,500. The only thing that is close is lumber. All the other supplies and building materials have to be brought in.

Mount Revelstoke National Park: there is $10,000 for the construction of a garage, and the moving of the stores building; and $10,000 for construction of an entrance gate; and $4,500 for the construction of a patrol cabin.

Mr. MCLEOD: That $10,000 for the gate also includes an access road, not just the gate.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There will be something in the supplementary estimates for the road because the understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway took a long time to come about and the awarding of the contract for the construction of the road was delayed.

Mr. MCLEOD: The access road will be in addition to the $10,000 for the gate?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is there any tourist accommodation in Mount Revelstoke Park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a cabin at the top, and it is very good. I was there over-night. It is good accommodation and very interesting.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is run as a chalet?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am glad to hear that. I was up there about four years ago and I stayed in the warden's cabin. It was a very pleasant place. The alpines were the best I have seen in Canada, on top of Mount Revelstoke.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a person of Swiss nationality who is in charge up there and he is doing a good job. I was up there in July and on top of the mountain there was as much as five or six feet of snow.

Mr. HARKNESS: With flowers growing out through it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is a very interesting place to go, and very few people used to get up to it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is really very nice.

Mr. MCLEOD: We hear a lot about ski jumps. Are we doing any development on Mount Revelstoke in that regard?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MCLEOD: I know that the provincial championships are held up on that mountain.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am informed that a jump is already developed there.

Mr. MCLEOD: It could be improved, of course.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Everything can be improved, Mr. McLeod, given the money.

Point Pelee National Park. Construction of a water system and two comfort stations, $55,400; construction of another comfort station and consolidated camp ground $10,000; beach protection work, at West Beach near the entrance gate, and End of the Point, $8,500. And there are three small items of $2,000 and less.

Mr. MICHENER: Why are there two comfort stations over $2,500 each?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said a water system and two comfort stations.

Prince Albert National Park: $98,350; construction of one semi-detached staff residence in Waskesiu township, $27,000; continuation of logging and lumbering operations, $11,000; continuation of construction of a trailer park in Waskesiu townsite, $9,000. Construction of control dam and water diversion canal between Waskesiu and Heart lakes, $10,000; clearing the right of way for a future power line to Waskesiu townsite, $15,000; and a number of items below $5,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: Have you any questions, Walter?

The CHAIRMAN: I did not want to take up the time of the committee, but I have a lot in my mind.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe I explained that to the chairman after one of the meetings earlier this week.

The CHAIRMAN: I intend to make further representation privately and save time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Prince Edward Island National Park, $30,000; construction of a bathhouse at Stanhope lane, $16,000; continuation of developing camp grounds at Stanhope, Stanhope Lane, and Cavendish, $8,000; and three small items of $2,500 or less.

Riding Mountain National Park, $121,800; construction of a new administration building, $68,000; construction of a new warden station at Lake Audy, $25,000; clearing and posting of park boundaries, $5,000; improvements to Central Road, $5,000; seal coating townsite streets and by-pass, $14,000; one other item of $3,000; and one of $1,800.

Mr. DINSDALE: On this item, I am glad to see that Riding Mountain National Park is holding its own so far as attendance is concerned. It is still in the second position with almost one half a million visitors last summer.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, that was for the year previous. In 1954-55 the figure I have here was 503,225; and Mr. Churchill agrees that it includes a lot of thorough traffic from the southern entrance to the park to Dauphine, because the road is better than the provincial road, and it is a good short-cut.

Mr. DINSDALE: Actually it is on No. 10 highway which is sometimes referred to as the highway of the Americas right from Flin Flon to South America. It is a main tourist artery.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: The need for an administration building extension has been obvious.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not an extension, it is a new building.

Mr. DINSDALE: A new building completely?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It was the first time in my life that I was shown how the logs of a building become rotten. It was really in bad shape, and after close examination was made, later in the summer, it was found that it really had to be replaced. It is impossible to heat the administration building. It is too small, and for various other reasons we have to build a new one.

Mr. DINSDALE: The department has a responsibility for the little museum building, I believe?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: It also contains a small auditorium.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: What circumstances are required in providing more auditorium accommodation for public meetings, and so forth? That building was established in the very early days of the park, and the facilities there no longer meet the demand for accommodation of this type. What is the policy of the department in making provision for that sort of facility?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am discussing it now with the officers of the department. They had no representations to that effect. I do not think any were received. This is the first time that we have heard of the present accommodation at the auditorium not being sufficient. You are bringing news to us.

Mr. DINSDALE: The reason I mention it is that Riding Mountain National Park is becoming a very popular place for conventions and international gatherings and so on. Actually there is no suitable meeting place for such gatherings other than the dance hall and the cinema theatre which are commercially operated enterprises. Is it customary in national parks to make use of dance halls and theatres and so on to meet this particular need?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What is customary as far as conventions are concerned is for them to be held in hotels where they have convention rooms. I can hardly see that it would be up to the department to provide in the parks rooms where convention meetings can be held.

Mr. HELLYER: Here, here!

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It seems to me that it is up to private enterprise to provide those facilities; and to the extent that facilities exist at the park, they have been used for that purpose, which is good; but I do not believe we should spend the taxpayer's money for such a special purpose, or expressly, for that purpose.

Mr. DINSDALE: I was merely probing to get information.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is my feeling; but this is the first representation I have had, and my reaction is what I have said now, in thinking out loud, if I may say so.

Mr. DINSDALE: I am just wondering how the facilities at Riding Mountain Park would compare with similar public facilities at Banff?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: At Banff the facilities for the halls are in the hotels and in other private buildings. There is a museum in Banff, but we have not built any public hall. There is good accommodation at the Banff School of Fine Arts, but it is an extension of the University of Alberta. Mr. Hellyer could tell you more about that because he was a student there last summer.

Mr. DINSDALE: I can see the refining influence.

Mr. MICHENER: He should go back there.

The CHAIRMAN: But not stay there.

Mr. DINSDALE: One further question: there has been some discussion that a park such as Riding Mountain National Park might at some time in the future become available for winter sports and winter holidays. Who does the planning in that regard? The department, or private enterprise.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, the policy is as follows: if private enterprises comes to us and tell us that they are interested in having a ski development, we will study their plans and see what we can do as to slope-clearing, and roads to give access to the ski facilities which private enterprise has in mind. But first of all, we have to know if private enterprise is interested in putting up the capital to develop the ski facilities, and a lodge and restaurant facilities for the people who will ski. Up to now, in spite of the fact that the possibilities of ski development in Riding Mountain National Park have been under discussion for about—I do not know how long—they certainly have been under discussion since I have been in the department—in spite of that fact, nobody has come forward to tell me or the officers of the department that they are interested in putting up the capital for a ski development. You know, Mr. Dinsdale, it is pretty far away from Winnipeg.

Mr. DINSDALE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The closest large center of population would be Winnipeg which is approximately 150 miles by train. It is much farther than the Laurentians are from Montreal.

Mr. DINSDALE: I think it has the greatest potential for American tourists coming up from the south.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would, but you would have to put in quite an amount of capital to provide hotel facilities. Nobody has come to me or to the other officers of the department to say that they were interested in that.

Mr. DINSDALE: It is interesting to know at least that some exploration has been made in this regard.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes, and I can tell you that the hon. Mr. Garson and Mr. Weir have discussed this with me more than once.

St. Lawrence Island National Park, $28,800; landscaping and beach development at Mallorytown landing, $5,000; replacement of wharf at Georgina Island, $12,500; and there are three other items below $5,000.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Where is this park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is in the Thousand Islands in the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Is it not west of Brockville?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The first island is just opposite Fort Henry at Kingston, that is the western-most, and the eastern-most is in the international rapids section opposite Morrisburg. It is Broder island, and it is going to be flooded by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development.

Waterton Lakes National Park, $44,500; replacement of superintendent's residence, $30,000; and a number of small items of $4,000 or less.

Mr. MICHENER: The price of the residence is $30,000?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: You seem to do rather well by your superintendents?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you explain the cost, Mr. Hutchison. I am not an engineer, or an architect or a contractor.

Mr. J. A. HUTCHISON (*Director National Parks Branch*): The superintendent of course is the representative of the department and of Canada there, in the general park region, and he has a requirement not only for himself and for his family, but for the purpose of entertaining, which I can assure

you quite often he cannot escape. That makes it necessary, maybe, for the dignity of the job, and of the department, that something a little better than ordinary be supplied. The superintendent is under obligation to supply and furnish such a place, so probably it has its drawbacks from his point of view too.

Mr. MICHENER: This will be a completely new residence for the superintendent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes; it is very old now. I was out there last summer and the superintendent needs a new residence.

Mr. HARKNESS: How big a house is it? How many rooms?

Mr. HUTCHISON: There will be three bedrooms, a kitchen, dining room, living room, a utility room and an attached garage.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it of wood construction or brick?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Wood construction.

Mr. HUTCHISON: It is wood and stone.

Mr. HELLYER: Have you any idea of the floor area in square feet?

Mr. HUTCHISON: Not off-hand.

Mr. HELLYER: Do you think that the construction would cost half as much again as it would in Ottawa, for instance?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I beg your pardon.

Mr. HELLYER: I am asking your department if the construction would cost half as much again there as it would cost here, for instance?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is more costly there. Mr. Scott I believe could give you the answer.

Mr. G. L. SCOTT (*Chief Engineer National Parks Branch*): I would say it was about 2,000 square feet; there are three bedrooms, a living room, a dining room area, a utility room and a kitchen.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is no basement?

Mr. SCOTT: No basement.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems a pretty high price for a house of that size.

Mr. SCOTT: That was the estimate which the engineers gave us for a house of that size with water.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What would be the difference in cost in percentage between Waterton and Ottawa?

Mr. SCOTT: I would say it would be 20 per cent higher at Waterton at least.

Mr. HELLYER: How many bathrooms are there?

Mr. SCOTT: One bathroom.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Here is a special type of house for a special purpose. It is supposed to last for 40 years at least. I do not think that $30,000 is out of the way.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. It is a pretty decent house. The Waterton lakes park is close to the United States Glacier Park, and a number of important people from the northwest states come up to the park and we expect the superintendent to give them some hospitality.

Mr. MICHENER: There is nothing unreasonable about the proposed accommodation, but it struck me as being rather expensive. That may be because of the difficulty of access to the place. Is it right at the entrance to the park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a few miles from the entrance of the park.

Mr. MICHENER: It is a long time since I was up there.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: How many miles would it be from the entrance of the park? Seven miles I am told.

Mr. MICHENER: It is at the top of the lake?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: All kinds of people have built houses in there. There is no difficulty in doing so. I know that is so because I have stayed at private cottages there on numerous occasions. It strikes me that for that size of house, with that number of rooms, it is a pretty high cost.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It may be that your friends' houses were built only for use in summer, whereas the superintendent lives there in his house all the year round.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am thinking of a house of the same size built in Calgary or Lethbridge which is the closest city to it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would cost over $20,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: It would not cost anything like $30,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It would cost less because there is a differential of 20 per cent, as Mr. Scott has said.

Mr. JUTRAS: This is a one storey house?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It will be constructed by contract anyway. We are asking for tenders.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yoho National Parks, $48,595; commencement of construction of a fire road and otter trail, $12,000, and there is a series of small items of $5,000 and less.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. MONTEITH: While we are on that subject, I notice that last year's estimates totalled $3,738,000, and the estimated expenditures are $3,340,000; that is an under expenditure of $400,000, or more than 10 per cent. Just why was that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Would you tell me where that is?

Mr. MONTEITH: It is on page 405. I am sorry, the estimates are $3,738,985; and the estimated expenditure is just below that, and is $3,340,804.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is construction which we do not believe will be finished or can be finished before the 31st of March.

Mr. MONTIETH: In a particular spot?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. There are a number of unfinished projects. Revelstoke is one. I said a few moments ago that the expenditures for Revelstoke would have to be provided for in the supplementary estimates. But it was not expended last year. That is because we could not reach an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Therefore, there is—a lapsing balance. There is quite an amount provided for the construction of the Banff-Jasper highway but we could not even complete the first ten miles of construction because of bad weather. When I say "we", I mean the contractor could not.

Mr. MONTEITH: There is a similar amount in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you can order nice weather for us, then nothing will lapse.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. HARKNESS: Before we leave this parks item altogether, I notice there was a revenue of $962,000 to the end of 1954, and another $110,000 expected to the balance of the year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: How much of that revenue came from Banff?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Just a moment. What is the page? I find this at the end of number 296. The revenue in that period from April 1st to December 31st, 1954, for Banff National Park was $366,365; it is about one-third of the total revenue.

Mr. HARKNESS: Now, what is the general policy as far as the cost of admission to those parks is concerned? As far as the mountain parks are concerned you pay $2 and go into any one of them.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is that the general price of admission to any of the parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For the prairie parks, it is $1 for the season.

Mr. HARKNESS: And it is 50 cents for an individual entry?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Does that apply to the eastern parks too?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the eastern parks there is no charge except at Point Pelee.

Mr. DINSDALE: Why is that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There was never any charge made in those eastern parks; and they are far from being as fully developed as the western parks, or the prairie parks.

Mr. HELLYER: It could be because they spend so little on them in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are far from being as fully developed.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: They are more or less like roadside stands.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are smaller parks.

Mr. DINSDALE: Has any thought ever been given to making the admission sticker for one park apply to all parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The mountain park sticker applies to all parks in Canada. It costs $2 for the year.

Mr. DINSDALE: It covers the prairie parks?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It does.

Mr. DINSDALE: I know that the prairie parks sticker does not apply to the mountain parks.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you enter Riding Mountain National Park and you ask for a $2 sticker, you will get it and it will be good for the mountain parks.

Mr. DINSDALE: I have never had that proposition presented to me before.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 297?

Carried?

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the general policy as far as the park wardens are concerned? Are they left generally in the park in which they started, or are they moved from park to park? What is the general policy?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: My policy is to move them. Mr. Hutchison can elaborate on it. I do not know what the policy was before.

Mr. HUTCHISON: It has been within the park unit. They are moved as circumstances appear to justify; that is, a junior warden, grade 1, may have started in a district, that is to say, in a district which is lesser than a main district; and as he gains experience and as circumstances permit or justify, he is moved to a more important district.

Mr. HARKNESS: How much consideration is given to his family and the matter of his children in their getting to school and so forth?

Mr. HUTCHISON: To the greatest extent possible he is located so that his family may enjoy the amenities which are available.

Mr. HARKNESS: I had a complaint a while ago which I have never done anything about.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Send it to me.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is why I asked about the general policy. It would appear that one of the wardens had four or five children, quite a number anyway. He had been for some time close to a school and was moved to a place where he was miles and miles away from a school and he had to put his children out to board; and another man who was a single man, or who had no children was moved to that place where he had been. It seems to me that sort of thing should not happen.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, would you give me the name of the warden? I do not suppose there is any interest in giving it in public. But if you will give me the name and the circumstances I will look into the matter. Our policy certainly is to see to it that any warden who has a number of children will be near a place where he can send his children to school; and at far away places we try to place single men.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is why I brought the matter up. It seems to me that should be the policy followed, and that a man with several children should not be placed in an isolated spot.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am sure that we have a reasonable policy.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not know. This did not seem to be very reasonable.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you will give this complaint to me I will look after it.

Mr. HARKNESS: You said a minute ago that your policy was to move these people from park to park. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. I said that we moved them around. You asked me if it was my policy to move them around and I said yes, it was our policy to move them around. I did not answer you by saying from park to park

Mr. HARKNESS: I asked to begin with, whether it was from park to park.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I did not understand that part of the question. I understood you to ask if we moved them around and I said yes, that was our policy.

Mr. HARKNESS: Why is that followed?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not believe that a warden should become too much acquainted or too friendly with the people in a given district because part of his job is the enforcement of the law. For the same reason in cities policemen are changed around on their beats.

Mr. HARKNESS: On the same basis you would move around all the judges in the country.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is quite different, Mr. Harkness. It is also the policy of the department to move superintendents from park to park.

Mr. MICHENER: I think it is an unusual example of discrimination within this park setup and I would like to ask the minister about it. It seems to me that he is discriminating. I do not blame him for it, but it seems to me there is discrimination against his own province.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The reason is that the government of the province of Quebec never offered to the federal government for the purpose of a park, land which would be free of all encumbrances. That is the first requisite of establishing a park.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that the way the other parks have come about, by the offer of land?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the western parks, one park at least, Banff, was established in the 18 eighties. All the western parks were established by the federal government prior to 1930.

Mr. MICHENER: While they were in control?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, in control of the land and the natural resources, before they went from the federal government to the provinces.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it because there is no available land in Quebec?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I suppose there would be, but it has not been the policy of present governments.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There are several local parks and very large ones which are maintained by the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am thinking of Laurentides park for one; and of Mount Tremblant park.

There are a few provincial parks; but the provincial government has never offered the federal government any land for park purposes.

Mr. MICHENER: Perhaps the minister may not know it, but I imagine it could be ascertained. Has there been any move originating from the federal government with the idea of establishing such a park?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There have been some discussions between 1939 and 1944. I have read the correspondence in the files.

Mr. HARKNESS: Going back to the matter of your policy of moving wardens and so forth fairly frequently.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It all depends on what you mean by frequently.

Mr. HARKNESS: I understand from your remarks that it was your policy.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said it was our policy to move them around. I did not say frequently; it is not done every month.

Mr. HARKNESS: It would not be every month, but every year or two years. I would say that was quite frequently.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the case of superintendents, let us say that it is approximately five years. That would be reasonable.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to me that frequent moves are bound to destroy the efficiency of your operations, because they take a man away; and where it is a superintendent, it will take some considerable length of time for him to get into the picture when he goes into a new area. If you are going to move them fairly soon after they get in, then I think you are bound to impair their efficiency; and in addition you are going to cause a great deal of dissatisfaction among your staff because there are expenses of moving and difficulties in regard to the education of their children and so on, as well as other factors which you might put under this heading, such as a disruption of family life, and leaving the place where the man and his family have worked up a considerable number of friendships and so on.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe it is a good thing to move superintendents around every five years or so for the following reasons: first, the superintendents will have gathered experience and they will go to a park with new ideas for that park. Secondly, psychologically when a man comes in to a new post he will be wanting to make a good job of it. But after five, six, seven or eight years he might settle down and we are afraid he will lack imagination.

Mr. MONTEITH: That would not apply to ministers of the government, would it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well as far as I am concerned, I am only in my second year. Do you not believe there is something in what I say?

Mr. HARKNESS: When you say five years—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Five years or more.

Mr. HARKNESS: I would be inclined to agree because I would not look on five years as being a frequent move.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: —I agree it will take two years to have a good grasp of the administration of a large park.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as the wardens are concerned, how frequently do you plan to move them?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is no fixed time in the case of wardens; it is a matter of convenience and the other reasons mentioned by Mr. Hutchison.

Mr. HARKNESS: What do you mean?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You can not leave a warden in a far away place for a number of years. Each one if possible has to go to the more remote places in their turn.

Mr. HARKNESS: I would not think it should be in their turn. I think those places should be given to young single or unmarried men and that they should be placed in the more remote places.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what is done.

Mr. HARKNESS: And as they become married and have children, you would move them to more populated centers?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what is done.

Mr. HARKNESS: And also on the basis of higher pay or promotion, if their work is satisfactory.

Mr. HUTCHISON: Apart from the business of the warden services, the moving is probably inescapable, because you will have retirements, resignations, and sometimes the regrettable business of severing their employment in other ways, which go to create vacancies. The vacancies are advertised and you receive applications and the successful man gets the job. It may involve a move and at the same time there is a chain reaction away behind him, because there are other moves in order to replace him and so forth. So the movements may at times go a little more rapidly than even we like to see.

The CHAIRMAN: Do these items carry?

Carried.

We are now on item 298 "Grant to Jack Miner Migratory Bird Foundation". $5,000.00.

Mr. MICHENER: That is a very interesting item. I think most of the members of parliament receive the annual circular from the Jack Miner Bird Foundation which is sent out in accordance with the wishes of the late Jack Miner to members of parliament. Therefore, we have a pretty fair appreciation of the foundation and the great work of conservation which was done by Jack Miner in his lifetime, and of the good advertising which it has given to Canada. I do not think that anybody would question the amount, but I would like to know whether it has always been the same amount, or whether the department is developing any policy with respect to this particular conservation project, that is, whether it should be just maintained as it is or perhaps added to as time goes on. What is the outlook towards it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The grant in 1929-30 and in 1930-31 was $5,000 each year. In the two following years it was $2,500 each year. In 1934-35, it

was $2,250; in 1935-36 it was $3,500; and in 1936-37 to 1939-40 it was $4,000; 1940-41, to 45, it was $2,500; 1946-47 it was $5,000. With respect to an enlargement, we do not believe it would be good policy.

Mr. MICHENER: It is a sanctuary?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We do not believe we should enlarge it, shall I say, and artificially provide feed to a great number of migratory birds because it might disrupt their migration.

Mr. MICHENER: In its present extent the policy is to assist in the maintenance of the sanctuary.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is a division of opinion. Some say it is good and some say it is bad.

Mr. HELLYER: From the standpoint of tourist attraction I think it would be very advantageous.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Some conservationists say that it is bad because they think it might have a tendency of disrupting the migration of migratory birds.

Mr. MICHENER: You mean that the migratory birds might be tempted to stay where there is plenty of food and not go to their regular breeding grounds?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: But just stopping off in their migration, we think they can rest safely?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well...up to now—I have felt that I could recommend the annual expenditure of $5,000.

Mr. MICHENER: You are not concerned with seeing it enlarged?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MICHENER: I notice that the foundation itself has literature or publications put out to try to build up the plan and enlarge the sanctuary from its present operations.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We would not encourage them to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Item 299 "Special Grant to the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society to help defray cost of urgent work for the restoration and preservation of the Chateau de Ramezay, Montreal" $15,000.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Was that money granted at the request of the association?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In 1949 the society applied for a federal grant of $60,000. There was a need for major repair. In view of the representations received and in view of the historic importance of the building, the government agreed to include a special grant of $40,000 in the estimates of the previous department of resources, and it developed in the year 1953-54 that the society has now expended a total of $44,000 on the restoration.

This $15,000 is provided this year to go on with the work on the interior. The work on the exterior has been terminated.

Mr. THATCHER: Will this be a continuing expenditure?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No; with this $15,000 we believe that they can finish the repairing of the inside.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I should know it, but who is the owner of the Chateau?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The owner is the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That was a special society which was set up many many years ago.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The chateau was acquired by that society in 1929, but do not ask me when the society was formed.

Mr. MICHENER: Do they undertake to maintain it after it has been repaired?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Oh yes, it is their property. The grant is given to that society on condition that they operate it as a historical museum which is open to the public.

Mr. HARKNESS: This appears to be the only historic building in Canada which the government does anything about preserving.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What about the Halifax Citadel? We are spending $100,000 a year on that, and that is the first example which comes to my mind. There are others.

Mr. MICHENER: Those are all public properties. This is private property.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: This was a very special case which was examined by the government.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am not complaining about this, I am very glad that the building is preserved, and is again put into good shape. The criticism which I have heard voiced frequently with regard to the whole matter of this marking of historic sites is that we have in the past, and are still continuing, to allow historic buildings to fall into ruin. Then a few years after they have fallen into ruins, we come along and put up a plaque or build a cairn, saying: "This was a historic site." In other words, this is a matter of locking the stable door and putting up a sign after the horse and everything of value is gone.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you will look at the order paper you will see that there is a bill to amend the Historic Sites Amendment Act, specifically to give the department power to acquire such buildings—a power which we do not possess at present. There is an amendment before the House now, and a discussion on second reading of the bill has already started. Mr. Dinsdale who is present here has said it was a good thing that this amendment was proposed for the purpose of acquiring old buildings, so I believe that you come here just about two months late with your representation.

The CHAIRMAN: Along the lines of what Mr. Harkness has just said, I would like to tell the committee about a case with which I was myself concerned. In this I agree with him. A cairn had been put up at the site of the engagement at Batoche. I went over five or six years ago and found a farmer starting to plow under the trenches that Middleton's soldiers had actually dug. I asked him to leave those trenches and assured him I would try to get the government to take over the property where they were located. The government was finally able to arrange, on the recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, to take over that property and to have those trenches preserved. I think it is much better to preserve those trenches which were actually dug by the soldiers in 1885 than to have a plaque marking the spot where they once were.

Mr. HARKNESS: I fully agree. That is the whole point I am getting at.

The CHAIRMAN: I mentioned my experience to uphold what you have mentioned—I think it is the right idea.

Mr. HARKNESS: May I follow that up for a moment. Do I understand from what you have said Mr. Lesage, that the policy is now changed, and that it is now to acquire and preserve these historic buildings?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We had the power to acquire historic buildings, but we did not have the power to acquire old buildings which present special interest

because they are relics of an old architectural period—representative of the architecture of two centuries or more ago—and also to acquire buildings which represent a special period of time in our history.

Mr. HARKNESS: Then the policy now is to acquire a certain number of these buildings?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We are assuming parliament will give us the power to acquire when such acquisition is recommended by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, which is a non-government board.

Mr. HARKNESS: To get the thing a little clearer, is the government prepared now to take over and preserve some of these historic buildings? When we say "acquire" I imagine that in most cases the acquisition would be by means of a gift.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If we have a recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board we will acquire, as we have the means to do so, with the moneys which are provided for that purpose by parliament.

Mr. HARKNESS: Are you proposing to ask parliament for a certain amount of money for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Each year has different problems when we are presenting our estimates to parliament.

An Hon. MEMBER: I want to get back to the estate at Ramezay.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have a few—a very few—items to go; we would then be able to relieve my parks people.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is now 25 minutes to six and I move we adjourn.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Do not be difficult. These are very small items.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am not being difficult, I happen to have an appointment.

The CHAIRMAN: We can carry item 259?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Is the minister aware that there has been a report in the Montreal press recently that the area behind the Chateau Ramezay is being sold. I believe, by the city, and that garages and so on are being erected? I thought I would bring that to the attention of the department, because it would interfere a great deal with the historic outlook of that building and the area in general.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It might be, but I do not see how we do can anything—we have no ownership rights in the Chateau Ramezay.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall adjourn until 3.30 tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 20

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. J. C. W. Davis, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director; Dr. Winston Mair, Chief, Wild Life Service, and Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director, all of the National Parks Branch; Dr. F. L. Alcock, Chief Curator, National Museum of Canada; Mr. D. Leo Dolan, Director, Canadian Government Travel Bureau, and Mr. G. H. Ellis, Assistant Director.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Habel
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Simmons
Thatcher
Yuill—26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, March 30, 1955.

(26)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Deschatelets, Dinsdale, Garland, Habel, Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Thatcher, Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. J. C. W. Davis, Departmental Administrative Officer; Mr. J. A. Hutchison, Director, Dr. Winston Mair, Chief, Wild Life Service, and Mr. K. M. Turner, Executive Assistant to the Director, all of the National Parks Branch; Dr. F. J. Alcock, Chief Curator, National Museum of Canada; Mr. D. L. Dolan, Director, Canadian Government Travel Bureau, and Mr. G. H. Ellis, Assistant Director.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the National Parks Branch, Mr. Lesage and his officials answering questions thereon.

Items numbered 300 to 304 inclusive, and 295 were adopted.

Item numbered 333 relating to the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Canadian Government Travel Bureau was discussed and adopted.

At 5.40 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Thursday, March 31.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

56370—1½

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we are on item 300—Grant in aid of the development of the International Peace Garden, Manitoba, $10,000.

Mr. DINSDALE: On this item, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister will be glad to know that the Peace Garden Development is proceeding satisfactorily. We are sorry he was not able to include a visit to the Peace Garden last summer, but perhaps an opportunity will come sometime in the future. Of special interest in refernce to the Peace Garden grant is the increasing importance of the garden as a source of tourist traffic. The number of visitors each year is increasing very rapidly. Again, this is on a highway system which I have referred to before, that is, No. 10 highway which goes from Clear Lake to Flin Flon and is a very important tourist highway in that part of Canada. The minister I think will be aware that this grant has had a somewhat checkered history during recent years. It was discontinued for a time, and then it was brought back at the rate of $10,000 annually instead of the former rate of $15,000, as compared with the American grant of some $100,000 over a period of three years. That situation does present one difficulty. It is hard to match the development on the Canadian side with the $10,000 annual grant which the government provides, bearing in mind that for the development of the American side it amounts to some $33,000 per annum.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No comment.

Mr. DINSDALE: That is all I have to say.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: $10,000 is the comment.

Mr. DINSDALE: That is all I have to say at the moment.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I would like to see it, Mr. Dinsdale, and I hope to be able to do so at one time or another.

Mr. DINSDALE: I think that would be an excellent plan because I am sure the minister would be impressed by the development.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item is 301. Contribution to the Women's Wentworth Historical Society of Hamilton, Ontario, $1,000.

Is that item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 302. National Battlefields Commission. To provide for special works at National Battlefields Park, Quebec, $8,000.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: This is not in accordance with main grant?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. This is not the statutory provision of $125,000 a year which is paid each year to the commission under present legislation. The $8,000 is for special work on the Citadel Glacis in Quebec City.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 303—Canadian Wildlife Service, Wildlife Resources Conservation and Development, $455,703.

Mr. THATCHER: Did you not miss one item?

The CHAIRMAN: That is a statutory item.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is what I explained the other day. The responsibilities of the Wildlife Service are as follows:

To deal with questions of policy and method with respect to conservation, management and development of wildlife resources under control of the federal government, including fur-bearers, game and other wild animals and birds, and to obtain by scientific research information necessary for such conservation, management and development. These duties include the administration of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, in conjunction with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; to carry out investigations in the interest of conservation of the game and fur resources and other wild creatures in the Northwest Territories; management of wild animals, birds and fish in the National Parks of Canada; handling of national and international problems relating to wildlife resources as a national asset; cooperation with other agencies having similar interests and problems, and planning and carrying out scientific investigations relating to numbers, food, shelter, reproduction, migrations, diseases, parasites, predators, competitors, and uses of the wild creatures that constitute the resources being managed. Mr. W. Mair, who is chief of the Wildlife Service of the National Parks Branch is here this afternoon and I will ask him at this time to tell committee members what is the policy of the department regarding predator control, which was discussed when we were dealing with the warden service in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. W. MAIR (*Chief, Wildlife Service*): Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. The policy is now as it has always been, to control predators, in this case specifically wolves, in those areas where wildlife resources are being utilized and the predators appear to be detrimental to those resources. In the Mackenzie district the Territorial division of the Northern Administration and Lands branch and the Canadian Wildlife Service work jointly on a poison program which extends over a portion of the Wood Buffalo Park, a section of the Northwest Territories south and east of Great Slave Lake and over the area north from Yellowknife towards Coppermine and Great Bear Lake, and the area between Great Bear Lake and Great Slave lake west to the Mackenzie. In that particular area we have a research control program under which we are attempting to assess the results of predator control on the caribou population. That particular herd of caribou has been studied rather thoroughly and we know something about their vital statistics, so we should be able to deduce the benefit or otherwise of predator control, and see whether there is value for the money expended. We do not pay any bounties in the Northwest Territories, nor in the Yukon. Alberta and Saskatchewan have just discontinued paying bounties. British Columbia, Manitoba and Ontario have announced their intention to discontinuing their bounties on wolves within this coming year if possible.

Mr. HARKNESS: How many wolves have you killed in the past year?

Mr. MAIR: I have not got the figures yet.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about the year before?

Mr. MAIR: I just have to hazard a guess. About 198 were taken out of the Northwest Territories by the poison stations, but it should be noted that we do not pick up all the animals if we use 1080, sodium fluoroacetate. Some will stray some distance away, and we do not recover them. You can only judge the success of your program by the absence of wolves, and the absence of their tracks.

Mr. HARKNESS: But you figure that you kill a good many more than the 198 whose dead carcasses you pick up?

Mr. MAIR: I think that is a fair guess. When you use strychnine you expect to pick up 75 to 80 per cent of the animals killed, but when you use 1080 you may only find between 40 and 50 per cent.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the poison kill other animals to any extent?

Mr. MAIR: It does not, because the baits are placed in such a fashion that they are only really accessible to the wolves. They are put out far enough on the ice that the foxes will not reach them—the foxes do not go out that far. The situation with regard to the Arctic fox is not so easy to overcome.

Mr. MICHENER: So the poisoning of wolves has not resulted in the killing of other animals.

Mr. MAIR: No, there has been no detrimental effect.

Mr. THATCHER: Does the fact that the provincial governments are discontinuing the bounties mean that the danger from these wolves is becoming less.

Mr. MAIR: It is because the control system where government employees undertake the control is more effective. I think they have good predator control in some of the areas in Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and now in Alberta, as we have in some regions of the Northwest Territories. It is the system which is involved.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Mr. HARKNESS: No. There are several other questions I wish to ask on this Wildlife Service. I notice there are 20 technical officers mentioned here, 10 each of Grades III and Grade I. Where are these technical officers employed and what does the term mean in this case?

Mr. MAIR: The technical officers Grade III are wildlife biologists. They are professionally trained men on the permanent staff of the service. They are engaged in work in connection with migratory birds and, in some of the national parks and in the Northwest Territories, they are engaged on animal work. The 10 employed in Grade I are usually young men working on post-graduate work at the university. They do some work for us assisting our permanent staff.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose this work is largely done in the field.

Mr. MAIR: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: How many men would you have in the field last summer?

Mr. MAIR: They work throughout the year. It depends what type of work they are on. The people who have to do with migratory birds have the heaviest burden during the spring and summer and in the fall months; the men working on caribou work both in winter and in summer, but perhaps they have more work to do in winter than in the summer because it is easier to study the caribou on their winter ranges than when they are spread out over the summer feeding grounds.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the size of the headquarters office of the wildlife research division here in Ottawa.

Mr. MAIR: Four officers are permanently assigned to work in the eastern Arctic but their headquarters is actually at Ottawa. That applies also to the limnologists.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: How many officers do you have permanently in Ottawa—people who do not go to the field?

Mr. MAIR: There are 30 who do not.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That includes the stenographers.

Mr. MAIR: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: And the entire staff is 100. 75 of them then, are only in headquarters at intervals if at all.

Mr. MAIR: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there any officials stationed permanently in other parts of the country?

Mr. MAIR: Other than technical staff you mean? Our officers are right across Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there permanent officers elsewhere, in addition to Ottawa?

Mr. MAIR: Oh yes, there is one in Vancouver, one in Banff, two in Edmonton, one in Saskatoon, four in Mackenzie district (Fort Smith, Yellowknife, Fort Simpson and Aklavik), and other offices in Winnipeg, Kingston, Quebec, St. John's, Sackville.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there one at Churchill?

Mr. MAIR: No, there is not. We did have one at Churchill, but we moved him to Ottawa so that it is easier to send him to Baffin Island.

Mr. MICHENER: Would it be your department which sent a party up to Cape Henrietta in Hudson Bay in 1948. I remember that there was a party of scientists, 10 or 12 of them who went up on that Cape to study the Arctic Fauna and Flora.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That may have been Dr. Rousseau. He is the head of the Montreal Botanical Garden. He had a party in the North for the Quebec provincial government. That was in Northern Quebec.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the relationship of "Ducks Unlimited" to this service. Do you collaborate with them?

Mr. MAIR: Yes, there is close cooperation between Ducks Unlimited and this Service. They work on some occasions in the same survey teams with our officers, in the prairie provinces and their findings are incorporated in the findings of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and our Service.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the department support financially any of these projects?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, Mr. Michener.

Mr. MAIR: It is primarily a technical Service.

Mr. MICHENER: I see.

Mr. HARKNESS: Under the Migratory Birds Convention which we have with the United States, as I understand it there are certain seasons which we can declare to be shooting seasons for these migratory birds, and certain seasons when we are obligated not to.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. I understand that each year, somewhere around June, there is a meeting of provincial and federal representatives—this year it was in March—and then in consultation with the officers of the Canadian Wildlife Service, the dates of the open season in the various regions of Canada where there are migratory birds are fixed by mutual accord. These are discussed afterwards by North American wildlife conference at another meeting with the United States Wildlife Service. They are approved by both services.

Mr. HARKNESS: Under that agreement with the United States—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am sorry. I am reminded that our opening seasons are not approved by the United States Wildlife Service. There is an interchange of information as to their approved opening season and our own opening season in the various provinces.

Mr. HARKNESS: The convention in the United States does not really have any control over our open season—in other words it is a mutual arrangement between ourselves and the United States to say that there are only certain times when we can declare an open season.

Mr. MAIR: The season cannot open any earlier than the first of September, and it can only be open 3½ months. That is the greatest length. There is also a set date for closing. So there are certain limits, but within those outer limits we set our own season and they set theirs. Nonetheless, because this is an international convention we do attempt to consider their problems and they consider ours.

Mr. HARKNESS: This international convention prevents us having any open season before the first of September?

Mr. MAIR: That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: As you know, there have been quite a number of occasions in recent years in western Canada when ducks were eating up the crops of farmers and they have, I think, been given permission to shoot the ducks, even though the season was not open, in order to prevent the destruction of those crops. Does this convention allow us to take action in this way?

Mr. MAIR: We have certain special regulations which allow the declaration of an open area for the protection of crops, and these regulations exist specifically for that purpose.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is what I am getting at. The convention does allow us to shoot in order to prevent the destruction of crops outside the period agreed upon as the open season.

Mr. MAIR: That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask Mr. Mair a question which I am afraid may be a little late in coming. I would like to know whether he read the book which was written a couple of years ago by Mowat, and what his views are as to the disappearance of the deer, and what might be done about it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You mean the caribou?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, caribou particularly in the eastern Arctic.

Mr. MAIR: I have not read the book through in its entirey. I have read it in part. May I say it is a very well written book. It is not entirely factually correct. I think it overlooks the point that one of the major problems of the Eskimos who live entirely on caribou is that they are dependent on the appearance of the caribou at migration time, and we have learned from experience over the years that there are considerable shifts in population. They are almost nomadic. They seem to wander, and they may change area. If they do not show up one year, then the native population is, as it were, completely without food since most of the Eskimo are accustomed to living on caribou and are not fond of fish and will not live on fish. Or the next year they may have more caribou than they know what to do with.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Michener's question was about the depletion of the caribou.

Mr. MICHENER: My recollection is that he indicated that depletion was progressively going on and that the caribou were really the foundation of the life of the Eskimo, and that we were not doing enough about it.

Mr. MAIR: I think there has been depletion of caribou herds over the years. It is difficult to say what the background to it was. I think in part it was due to forest fires in the wintering areas, that may have had very much to do with it, as well as other disturbances which have cut off caribou migration. Certainly there was too heavy a take of caribou at one time, but since then they have cut that down. Some of those herds are gradually regaining their status, while others are still in a fairly critical condition.

Mr. MICHENER: Another suggestion was that the reindeer might be used to good advantage, as they have been in Greenland. I wondered if your Service had made any study of the practices that were followed in Greenland, or if Eskimo deer were integrated into the general life of colonies or herds of reindeer. They play a large part or should play a larger part in their economy.

Mr. MAIR: We have not particularly studied reindeer herding in Greenland. We have studied in considerable detail the records of the reindeer industry in Alaska, and such things, and the reports that are available on reindeer herding in Finland and so on. We have also read the reports which have been made on the tundra areas in Ungava and other places, but we have no program for reindeer. In part, reindeer herding is more a sociological problem than it is a biological one. The prerequisite to having a reindeer herd is to have people who take an interest in herding. For that reason, if an area is good caribou country, and the caribou can be brought back, it would seem that it would be desirable to have the caribou since they do not require herding, and can be hunted as required.

Mr. MICHENER: Have you come to any conclusion about the caribou population which could be supported in the Canadian arctic?

Mr. MAIR: No.

Mr. MICHENER: I mean any comparison with what we actually have today?

Mr. MAIR: I do not think we have attempted to assess the total population which might be supported, except to say that the figures which were given earlier, something like 40 million, were, in our opinion, more or less exaggerated, and the country never could have supported that number.

Mr. MICHENER: I was not present on Monday, Mr. Chairman, and there are one or two things I am interested in. I thought that Dr. Mair could tell us whether we could support a substantially larger caribou herd, and I understood that one of the functions of the wild-life service was to see how that could be done.

Mr. MAIR: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Is the hunting of caribou permitted to others besides Indians?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That was dealt with under the heading of "Warden Service in the Northwest Territories" and the answer was "no", it is for the Indians and the Eskimos only.

Mr. MICHENER: It used to be.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes; but today it is only for the Indians and Eskimos plus five animals for food only per year for the legitimate resident.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there any commercial taking of caribou or of any other arctic animals at the present time?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not of caribou. There is a commercial taking of—well, you might shoot a fox, if you were a trapper, and white bears, polar bears, and seals.

Mr. MICHENER: White bears are in the prohibited class, are they not?

Mr. MAIR: Only the Eskimo is allowed to take polar bears.

Mr. MICHENER: I wanted to get a permit to shoot one, and I wrote to Ottawa but I did not get the permit.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is always a good excuse. If you are attacked by one, you can shoot it.

Mr. MICHENER: Well, my excuse was to take one for the purposes of a museum.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You have heard stories about people who said they were attacked by deer during a prohibited season and had to shoot them.

Mr. MICHENER: Does the white whale come under your department?

Mr. MAIR: No. That is Department of Fisheries.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. HARKNESS: I see that the rental of equipment is $48,000 and that it was $36,000 last year. What sort of equipment is that?

Mr. MAIR: It is almost entirely aircraft. Something like $5,000 is for boats, dog teams, and minor items of that sort. The rest is for aircraft.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is really a transportation item.

Mr. MAIR: Yes, for services in the arctic region.

Mr. MICHENER: On the question of taking deer, I would like to ask the minister, in view of the controversy which was stirred up by the book, if it would not be worthwhile considering inviting the author to come here to this committee?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Dr. Porsild has given an answer to the accusation. Mr. Mowat's book is about the people at Ennadai' lake. My deputy minister received a letter not more than ten days ago from Mr. James Houston who was stranded at Ennadai' lake for a few days, as every member of the committee knows.

Mr. MICHENER: When he was forced down?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: When he was forced down, and he told the deputy minister in the letter, which I read, that the conditions at Ennadai' lake were very good, that the caribou hunting this winter had been excellent, that there was a good reserve of caribou, and that there were caches of buffalo meat around. Moreover, fox trapping had been excellent as well this winter.

As was mentioned here when we were discussing the situation of the Eskimo of Keewatin, we now have northern service officers. We have six of them, one is stationed at Churchill. He has started on his work, and will be conducting the year round, many trips to Ennadai' lake and to other places in Keewatin where we have Eskimo, to see what the conditions are.

Mr. Kerr, the northern service officer, has already been to Ennadai' lake two or three times. He has been there twice since December, and the reports have been good. There is this new system of having northern service officers in the north who are working with the R.C.M.P. Those gentlemen are going to see to it that the Eskimo are provided for at all times in the future.

I would like to say that there might be an accident of some kind because these people are nomads. They might stray away on a caribou hunt, and it might be impossible to find them. But certainly this new system of having northern service officers is the best system that can be devised,—although it is a pretty costly one,—to see to it that the Eskimo do not starve.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it from what the minister says that the complaints or charges of the book have been thoroughly considered by the officials of his department and they are satisfied that they are doing what can be done to meet anything that might need attention.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have always contended that Mr. Mowat's assertions were exaggerated, but there has been starvation in the north at various times among the Eskimo. That cannot be denied.

The CHAIRMAN: How do you spell the name of that lake?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: E-n-n-a-d-a-i-'.

Mr. MICHENER: What was the name of the doctor you mentioned?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Dr. Porsild.

Mr. MICHENER: Where was his account of the matter published?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: He is a civil servant in the museum; he is an expert on arctic flora, and has spent many years of his life in the north, and that was the work that Mr. Mowat was involved in, when he was in the north.

Mr. MAIR: He was a summer assistant to the Canadian Wildlife Service.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Mowat was in the Northwest Territories for only a few weeks, as an assistant for the Wildlife Service.

Mr. MICHENER: He went up on some expedition.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: He was there the previous year on an expedition. Altogether he spent not more than six months in the Territories. That was his experience in the north.

Mr. MICHENER: The answer is that the minister considers nothing would be served by inviting his evidence?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Nothing at all, because I am sure that the establishment of the new northern service officers is the best that can be devised. It is very costly however.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried? Carried.

Item 304.

Mr. MONTEITH: On item 303 I was wondering if there was any explanation of the reason for a lapsed vote in 1954-55, where it is estimated at $50,000. What items were not spent? $437,271 was the estimated expenditure, and $387,956, was spent leaving roughly $50,000 as a lapsed vote. You will find it at the bottom of page 407.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That does not jibe at all with what I have in my black book.

Mr. MAIR: That is a revised figure.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well then, which is the right figure?

Mr. MAIR: The one in the blue book.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Mair will give you the information.

Mr. MAIR: One of our heaviest expenses arises out of the northern services which are carried on. Sometimes we are able to make savings because of getting air-lifts by the RCAF into certain areas; or sometimes at no cost, by some of the aircraft companies if they are going into certain areas. Also, if the weather is not good and we cannot fly on a service, then automatically there is a saving of from $5,000 to $6,000, or $10,000. Actually at the present moment we are hoping to fly a service which has been held up about ten days, and get a caribou re-survey underway. That means about $500 to $600 a day which is lapsing.

Mr. MONTEITH: Where does that show up here?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Rental of equipment.

Mr. MONTEITH: The total of this would be about $80,000, but we actually spent only about $30,000 roughly last year.

Mr. MAIR: There is another fairly significant saving on salaries.

Mr. MONTEITH: You mean you do not have as many employees as expected?

Mr. MAIR: Through lack of filling positions, or people who are away on educational leave and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Item 304 "National Museum of Canada".

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Dr. Alcock will please come forward. He is the director of the National Museum of Canada.

Mr. DINSDALE: I have looked at the information in the annual report of the department and notice that it divides the functions of the national museum into three parts. First, there is the collection and preservation for posterity of anthropological and natural history material. Does that mean that regardless of where this anthropological material is found, it is gathered into a central museum, or is it kept as close to the local area as possible?

Dr. F. J. ALCOCK (*Director of the National Museum of Canada*): It all depends who collects it. All material which is collected by our anthropological division naturally comes here for study purposes. Material collected by other institutions stays with them. For example the University of British Columbia may be carrying out a project in British Columbia excavating some site, and they will keep material they find. But anything we collect comes here, and we do most of the archaeological work in Canada.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is it the intention of the department eventually to have more than one museum in Canada?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is government policy, and the intention at the present time is not to have more than one.

Mr. DINSDALE: Certain archaeologocial explorations have been going on in Manitoba, some of them quite close to my city, and some very interesting Indian specimens have been located, but they are immediately whisked away down to the museum. There has been some local expression of opinion that it might be desirable to retain them as close to the area of discovery as possible.

Mr. ALCOCK: We have had one of our archaeologists out in Manitoba for two summers getting in touch with all those local collectors. Most of the latter are not trained people. They do collect and they are interested and we are very glad that they are. We have done that in Saskatchewan too. Dr. Wittlaufer is now employed by the Saskatchewan government after training with us, and Dr. MacNeish is one of the permanent members of our staff. We do keep in touch with what the local people are doing out there. In one or two cases we have tried to get some material collected in this way brought to Ottawa for study; but the material so collected is kept by the local museum or, if borrowed is returned to the local museums, after it has been studied. Our field men help the local collectors in classifying their material.

Mr. DINSDALE: It would seem that if the local areas would like to hang on to any of those specimens, they have to get their prior claim in.

Dr. ALCOCK: No attempt is made to force any of them to send their material down here.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In order to have a careful study of all these finds, that study has to be made at a central point, so that comparison can be made.

Dr. ALCOCK: And the studies have to be made by qualified, trained men. Things dug up are just curiosities if they are collected by an untrained individual. But if they are collected by a scientist who can establish the different cultures, then the material becomes valuable. That is the reason legislation has been established in some of the provinces to protect archaeological sites.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Manitoba has enacted very good legislation.

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes, and so has Ontario.

Mr. DINSDALE: You work very closely with the anthropologists at the various universities.

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes. Toronto and British Columbia have strong departments. Toronto and British Columbia are the two universities which give training in anthropology and we keep in very close touch with what they are doing.

Mr. DINSDALE: If a certain area was going to be explored, and a university in that province had an anthropology department, would the exploration be carried on in consultation with the university department or independently?

Dr. ALCOCK: It would be carried on in consultation with our people. An anthropologist goes to British Columbia every summer and he goes to the university to see what they are doing, and if they are working at a site, he visits that site. So we do have close cooperation between the provincial department and our own.

Mr. DINSDALE: I think that covers the first part of the question and I am now going on to the next.

Mr. MONTEITH: I was wondering: you will recall when we discussed citizenship and immigration, I think we were talking about the art gallery, and I believe it was said there was some Indian art work down there and that type of thing. A question was raised about it. Would it not be more satisfactory all around if both the Eskimo and the Indian art work, and work of that nature were under the same department? Now I believe the answer given at that time was: well, Eskimo work is entirely under Northern Affairs, that is why we just do not want to interfere. Would the minister have any comment as to whether it might be more economical and satisfactory all around if the two branches were placed under the one sponsorship, or were handled by one department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: According to my information and according to my own eyes, Indian art material is in our museum.

Dr. ALCOCK: There was an exhibition held in the art gallery, but it was an exhibition of material owned by our department.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Dr. ALCOCK: It was held in the art gallery because they have a room suitable for it, while our museum did not have the necessary space to show it to advantage.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Our museum is under the direction of Dr. Alcock.

Mr. MONTEITH: I gathered that there had been some collection of certain works in the art gallery but which were under the management of the Indian branch. Do you recall that?

The CHAIRMAN: I remember they said they had some material that might be regarded as art work, and there was no place to store it properly.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It was being collected by this department.

The CHAIRMAN: You turned it over to them.

Dr. ALCOCK: No. We have it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It was just exhibited in one of the rooms of the National Gallery because we had no room of our own to exhibit it.

The CHAIRMAN: The impression was left that they had accumulated some of these things.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you go down there, Mr. Monteith, you will see in the museum the collection of Indian art in the National Museum.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Is it James Houston who was appointed by your department to do the work in Eskimo art and handicraft?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Handicraft and Eskimo Art.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What are his functions?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Robertson will answer that question. This is under northern affairs.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Houston is the head of one of the sections in the new Arctic division in the northern administration branch. His particular work is to encourage the development of Eskimo art and handicraft generally because it is of artistic significance and worth encouragement and preservation, but more so economically because the area in which it has been developed to the highest point is the area where the hunting economy has suffered the worst, namely in the north part of Quebec on the east coast of Hudson Bay. He has been encouraging the Eskimos to engage in this natural ability which they have always had of carving, and he is also engaged in encouraging interest in this in other parts because there is a very high interest not only in Canada and North America but throughout Europe in Eskimo carvings. There are certain sections in the north where the income from stone carving alone exceeds the income from trapping.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Certainly you are to be congratulated in these steps which you have taken, and it is just in time.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask whether the museum is making its own collection of Eskimo art?

Mr. ROBERTSON: The department is collecting Eskimo art in two ways; partly as an addition to the museum collection, and partly also for travelling collections which can be sent abroad to encourage interest in this thing. We have one collection which is on tour at the present time in the United States and we are hoping to establish a second collection next autumn from the shipments which will come at the end of the navigation season. That section will be sent on a European tour. There is a very great demand for showings of this.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there a collection here in the museum at the present time?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. Monteith, we have found the reference, and it is at page 224 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence. It was in answer to a question by Mr. Nesbitt.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: The building in which these exhibitions are housed is quite old, is it not?

Dr. ALCOCK: It was completed in 1910.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: What steps have been taken to protect it from possible fire hazard?

Dr. ALCOCK: I do not think there is any great fire hazard. There has been more concern about the fact that it has settled somewhat. The museum as built originally had a big square Norman keep over the doorway, and it was so heavy and the museum bed so soft that a certain amount of settling took place. It has apparently stabilized now, however just over a year ago the National Research Council put down three borings and they had to go down 133 feet to get to bed rock. They have been studying the building now for a considerable number of years and they have decided that there is no danger of further settling.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That could happen to anything, but there is the fire hazard surely in an old building.

Dr. ALCOCK: It is a stone building with tile floors in the rotunda, and as yet we have had no fires.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: This is not a criticism, it is an expression of concern because the exhibition is becoming more valuable every year.

Dr. ALCOCK: That is very true. We have the fire inspectors around and they have had doors put in the basement that will close off various sections automatically should a fire break out. The fire situation has been pretty carefully looked into.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: You have done the best you could?

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes and we feel that the situation in that regard is fairly satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Are you ready, Dr. Alcock, to answer Mr. Monteith's question?

Dr. ALCOCK: We have a tremendous amount of Indian material and have been getting Eskimo material now for a long period of time. We are buying some every year in order to trace its development from the early days when they were on their own and now as to how they are improving.

Mr. McCurry says:

> As far as Eskimo art is concerned, while we would like to have a collection of Eskimo art, and the trustees may decide to enter the field, the work of the Eskimos is nevertheless being collected by the National Museum. . . .

Mr. MONTEITH: It would seem somewhat unsound for the Art Gallery to go into the Indian collection when you people have that well in hand.

Dr. ALCOCK: I hardly see any reason why they should since the National Museum is doing so much in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose then that you should confer with the director of the National Gallery.

Dr. ALCOCK: We work together and cooperate in many ways.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If you read the reports at page 222 you will see that the question was "North American Indian Art done on hides." Well, they may be assimilated to painting. Maybe that is the difference.

Mr. MONTEITH: And that sort of thing.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I cannot read Mr. McCurry's mind, but I am trying to find an explanation to his answer. The question had to do with painting on hides.

Mr. MONTEITH: I think we had an answer. Apparently there is no reason why they should go into it.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As far as Indian paintings on hides are concerned it might be of interest to a gallery because they would be original paintings in North America. There certainly might be an interest in the National Gallery getting this type of thing.

Mr. MONTEITH: Are there any paintings on hides by Eskimos?

Mr. ROBERTSON: I do not think there are any paintings on hides, but there are a lot of engravings on stone, on plaques, on basketry and on certain dyed glasses and that sort of thing.

Mr. MONTEITH: I saw Mr. Houston's collection on Eskimo carvings and so on when it was here.

Mr. ROBERTSON: That was part of the National Museum collection.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose you can't draw a definite line between archaeology and sculpture. A lot of these Eskimo things are plain sculpture and should be in the museum.

Dr. ALCOCK: We are getting out a series of volumes on Indian art. Several volumes are being prepared at the present time on the art of the Haida Indians of the Queen Charlotte Islands. One of these volumes by Dr. Marius Barbeau will be an analysis of Indian art.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask a question about your field parties. I take it that the museum sends out parties.

Mr. ALCOCK: Yes. We send out around 20 a year. 19 are proposed for this year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They have them in the fields of zoology, archaeology, and ethnology.

Mr. MICHENER: Do these parties work independently or jointly with the wildlife service?

Dr. ALCOCK: They are quite separate. The museum's interest is in the subject of taxonomy which means the classification, for instance, of birds, mammals, etc. I suppose we have over 40,000 birds belonging to the 500 species or so in Canada, specimens collected right from Halifax to Vancouver and north to the Arctic, and we can trace the transition in size, coloration, etc. of the same species of bird. We want to know all about birds in Canada and all about other natural history groups such as the mammals, etc. of Canada. We are preparing a new book on the Birds of Canada and getting out a new edition of Jenness' "Indians of Canada". These are just two of our important museum bulletins. We have published over 130 National Museum bulletins which will give you some idea of the amount of research work we have done.

Mr. MICHENER: I suppose your interest is purely scientific, whereas the wildlife division is interested in the animals from an economic point of view?

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder if there is any scope for cooperation in your field parties.

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes. For instance, one of our parties this year is starting on a project to study the varieties of caribou in Canada. That is done at the request of the Wildlife Service who are interested in where the caribou are and how many there are and their migrations. But whether there is more than one species or variety is a scientific problem which our Museum Mammalogist will start on this summer. We will have to study the caribou at various places. That is one case where we are working hand and hand with the Wildlife people.

Mr. MICHENER: I am thinking of it in the field of operations. Where both services have parties going out in the same section of Canada might they use the same transportation, quarters and perhaps the same supplies and in that way effect some economy. I wonder if any effort is made to coordinate these two services?

Mr. C. W. JACKSON (*Assistant Deputy Minister*): I might say, Mr. Chairman, that several years ago we set up a joint committee representing the Wildlife Division on the one hand, and the National Museum on the other, so that there would be no duplication of work. That committee I believe is still functioning and there is no overlapping or duplication.

Mr. MICHENER: I am glad to hear that. Particularly in the scientific field you may even find two parties doing exactly the same work and coming up, I hope, with the same results.

Mr. DINSDALE: I see that there are no grants, so I suppose that the officials of the museum plan to do all the research within their own resources?

Dr. ALCOCK: We have certain people like Miss Helen Creighton who has been working with us in ethnology for eight summers part time, from about May 1 to the end of the calendar year. We have a few parties like that, but most of our work is done by our own scientific staff.

Mr. DINSDALE: Work of that kind would be covered by such items in the estimates as seasonal employees?

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes. Seasonal assistants.

Mr. DINSDALE: That would cover your students who assist you in the field?

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes. The seasonal help includes also students and sometimes labourers. For instance, on our archaeological projects we often have people who do the actual digging.

Mr. DINSDALE: What is meant by museum advisors?

Dr. ALCOCK: Miss Creighton is one of that type. It is a way of getting work done very cheaply. We pay these people $5 a day and field expenses while they are working, their employment is controlled by the National Museum, and we hire people whom we know are thoroughly qualified. They are underpaid, but they like their work so much that they are willing to carry on year after year.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is Miss Creighton associated with the university?

Dr. ALCOCK: No, she worked in the United States for a while with the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, but lately she has been working for us. She has published several books, one of them a National Museum bulletin on Lunenburg County, N.S.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It is certainly gratifying to know that the department is on its toes with respect to research in the Indian and Eskimo field. And we should be on our toes; after all that is our field, so to speak. How does your volume of research compare to similar work being carried on by the Americans in the United States on their Indians.

Dr. ALCOCK: Of course the appropriation for the Smithsonian Museum is many many times what ours is.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: You need more money?

Dr. ALCOCK: Of course we do.

Mr. MICHENER: Did you spend all your money last year?

Dr. ALCOCK: Very close to it.

Mr. MICHENER: $271,000 out of $305,000 voted.

Mr. K. M. TURNER (*Assistant to the Director, National Parks Branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources*): It will be spent.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Those were the figures at the time the book was printed.

Mr. HARKNESS: In recent years have you had any parties in the Red Deer valley on dinosaur work?

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes, and there will be another one this summer.

Mr. HARKNESS: At the present time it is proposed to establish a provincial park and provincial museum in that so called dinosaur valley. Would any of the specimens you recover be available for that?

Dr. ALCOCK: Possibly. We like to keep as many of the specimens as possible at Ottawa for study.

Mr. HARKNESS: You have a large number already.

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes, and a lot more stored. We have ready for display three large ones and many others in completed forms which we will put on display as soon as there is the necessary space.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: We could send you some from Quebec.

Mr. DINSDALE: What are some of your larger projects which are under way at the moment?

Dr. ALCOCK: Let us take archaeology for instance. Last summer while working down in the Arctic coast Dr. MacNeish found a very important archaeological site. This year he will be digging that site. He will have a

helper and about six Eskimos with him and he expects to spend as long a season as possible to get as much information as he can. That will give us much new information about the arrival of early man to the Canadian Arctic.

Mr. Lee will be continuing the excavation of a site on Manitoulin Island. He has been there four seasons now. It is a tremendously important site—covering about 30 acres on which are numerous artifacts of early man. One of the problems involved is that these occur with boulder clay deposited at the time the last ice sheet came down, and it is possible these men were living perhaps 10,000 or more years ago.

Mr. DINSDALE: With regard to the dissemination of the results of your research—I see two items covering publications and films. I suppose that item "publications" includes books.

Dr. ALCOCK: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: That is in addition to the smaller reports?

Dr. ALCOCK: Our bigger books are called bulletins, and, as I mentioned, we have had over 130 of them published up to now. I have several in the hands of the Queen's printer at the present time, and a number more which are ready for the Queen's printer.

Mr. DINSDALE: This totem pole book, is that one of the latest?

Dr. ALCOCK: It came out three years ago. We have got a couple more on West Coast Indian culture on the way now.

Mr. MONTEITH: How does that work when a department draws up a publication and sends it to the Queen's printer? Is there any charge to the department for the work done?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: They do charge the department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: That represents the money which goes in to make up this item?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: I see there is a small amount here for postage, and I have seen such sums as $40 in other places for postage. The practice of using stamps must be in competition with the use of the franking system, and I was wondering what the explanation might be.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are two sources of expenditure over and above that with regard to the usual outgoing mail for which franking is used. This is in connection with urgent letters which need to be posted after hours and also for incoming mail from the parties in the field.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the explanation of this amount?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right. The frank covers the outgoing mail.

The CHAIRMAN: Except when the frank is locked up after hours.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will find the amount of expenditure for the usual postage under departmental administration on page 293. It is $12,000. But in each branch or division or section there is a small amount to provide for the cases which I have mentioned.

Mr. MICHENER: And this $12,000 is an accounting item between your department and the post office.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right.

Mr. DINSDALE: Reverting to publications. Have any of those books become "best sellers" or is the distribution limited?

Dr. ALCOCK: As a matter of fact "Birds of Canada" has been out of print for some time. Mr. Godfrey of the Museum staff is preparing a new edition

and it will be a couple of years before the manuscript is finally completed. "Indians of Canada" is now out of print and there are no copies at all left now, and the Queen's printer is publishing a new edition at his own expense. As a matter of fact, the Queen's printer has taken a number of our publications to publish at his own expense. We buy enough copies of such a publication to provide for our free distribution list—we exchange publications with other museums and similar institutions throughout the world who are doing work similar to our own. They provide us with copies of their publications free, and we in turn send free copies of our publications to them. So, as I say, we buy enough copies from the Queen's printer to look after our distribution list, and then the Queen's printer sells the book and makes what profit he can.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I said a few moments ago that we are paying the Queen's printer for our work, but Dr. Alcock has just said that the Queen's printer in certain instances will print books for publication at his own expense when he thinks that the sales will be good enough to enable him to sell the whole edition.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is this item with respect to revenue, Mr. Chairman?

Dr. ALCOCK: We derive a revenue from the sale of our publications. Somebody will write in for a volume which we have printed, and we make a charge. We only give out copies for free distribution when we are getting things back in return.

Mr. DINSDALE: With regard to the item concerning films. What films are available, Dr. Alcock?

Dr. ALCOCK: We buy a few films for the Saturday morning programs for children. For over 40 years now we have had children's programs at the museum and we buy a few films on natural history subjects. Some of these we loan to schools and to other people who want them. There are a few other films which we just use ourselves in order to avoid possible damage, but we have a small stock of films for our educational work.

Mr. DINSDALE: Do any of these films become available for distribution?

Dr. ALCOCK: Some of our field officers do take motion pictures to illustrate their work. These are sometimes prepared into documentaries by the National Film Board.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You could mention the television show "Let's go to the Museum".

Dr. ALCOCK: Yes. This year we started a television program. About two years ago I wrote to C.B.O.T. saying that when they were ready we would be glad to help them put on television broadcasts about our Museum. Last fall we put on 13. Apparently they liked them for we were asked to put on another series of 13 shows. This fiscal year we have therefore put on 26 programs. We have had some very favourable reports from right across Canada regarding them.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I can say, Dr. Alcock, that they have been well received in Montreal. With regard to the distribution list of publications which you have mentioned. Would your free list include universities—Canadian universities?

Dr. ALCOCK: Universities which are sending us material. A lot of universities get out research material of their own. One librarian makes a list from time to time and tries to make a fair exchange.

Mr. HARKNESS: I notice there is no item here providing for the acquisition of specimens. Take these Eskimo carvings and things of that sort. The Eskimos would not want to part from such things unless they were paid for it.

Dr. ALCOCK: That comes under "Sundries". It is $1,500.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is all the provision you have for the acquisition of specimens?

Dr. ALCOCK: We paid $500 for Eskimo carvings this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON: There is another vote of $1,000 under Northern Administration for the acquisition of Eskimo carvings, but this collection does not relate entirely to the museums. Part of the collection is for a touring collection.

Mr. HARKNESS: In addition to acquiring these Eskimo carvings, I should think there might be totem poles and perhaps some of those painted Indian tents or painted skins or various other things which the minister has mentioned.

Dr. ALCOCK: We do acquire things by purchase. We cannot do too much at the present time because of lack of space in which to store things, but the time will come when we shall have more room and we shall then need more money.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As you can see Mr. Harkness, our administration is doing its best to save the money of the taxpayers in Canada.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is not a thing which has struck me very forcibly in the last 10 years.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, it has struck me since we have been sitting in this committee, because on every item we have discussed, and on every section it seems to me the comments were that we could do more.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Culturally speaking, you should increase this 400 per cent.

Mr. HARKNESS: Quite frankly I think that if there was some valuable piece of Eskimo work, or something of that kind which came up for disposal, for example, during the sale of an estate, funds should be available to purchase objects of that sort as they became available.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will certainly see that in the preparation of our next estimates, a transcript of what you have just said is clipped to my presentation to the Treasury Board.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is not the sort of thing you could vote $25,000 or $50,000 or $100,000 a year for. For two or three years you might not want to spend anything and then would come a year when you would want to spend, possibly $5,000. You might have a contingency fund.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: A revolving fund—that is what it is called in our financial circles.

Mr. MONTEITH: This revolving fund has a habit of not giving all the picture in one year.

The CHAIRMAN: What you are suggesting now, Mr. Harkness, is at variance to what was said with regard to the National Gallery by one of your colleagues. You were not here at that time. Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Branch administration, 295.

Mr. MICHENER: I asked about the advisory board. I was to hear something more about it under another item. I think it was the advisory board on the parks, or is there not an advisory board in one of your branches?

The CHAIRMAN: We have not carried 295 yet.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is an advisory council in Banff, but I have no question about that.

Mr. MICHENER: I asked who were the members of the advisory council, and what their functions were.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Was it the advisory committee of Northern Development which you had in mind?

Mr. MICHENER: I have forgotten. We will pass it over in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we carry item 295?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Thank you, Dr. Alcock. I will ask the director of the forestry branch to come up here tomorrow afternoon with his associates.

The CHAIRMAN: This is vote. 333.

Total, $1,561,367. Details on page 438.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Mr. D. L. Dolan, Director of the Canadian Government Travel Bureau, is here to answer questions if required.

Mr. GARLAND: On this item I wonder if Mr. Dolan would agree to make a short general statement concerning the policy of his Branch, taking into account the different fields of activity—federal, provincial and local activity carried on in the local areas, and of course, by the government on their part.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: May I, Mr. Garland, just set out what the general policy is and then ask Mr. Dolan to enlarge on it.

The division of responsibility between the provinces and the federal government as far as advertising is concerned is as follows: the federal government takes care of most of the advertising outside of Canada and as much as possible refrains from doing any advertising inside Canada. One of the reasons for this is that there has always been some danger of discriminating between the various regions of Canada. Even if we did not do that, we would be accused of doing it, and it would be impossible for us to carry advertising of certain parts of Canada in other parts without being subjected to criticism which may not be justified. Therefore we have an understanding with the provinces. As a matter of fact, there is a federal-provincial tourist conference every year. There was one on November 29, 30 and December 1, 1954, over which I presided, and it was attended by the provincial minister in charge of tourist travel bureaux or by their deputies, and this policy always has been agreed upon by everyone. From there on I believe Mr. Dolan can give you more details about what is being done in the provinces.

Mr. GARLAND: What I had in mind was this: Do I understand you to say that the policy is to do most of the advertising outside Canada on behalf of the provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not on behalf of the provinces—on behalf of Canada by encouraging travel to Canada.

Mr. GARLAND: And how is that policy and all those activities decided on? Do you have representatives from the provinces to work out the program with you, or do you do it by yourself?

Mr. D. L. DOLAN: We advertise a national program. To use a colloquial phrase, we "sell" Canada in the United States. We confer, as the minister has said, every year. For nine years we have had this conference with provincial organizations and the larger transportation interests so that we can frame a program which will be part of our great national program of tourist advertising. We have tried to place our program before the railways, steamships, bus lines and air lines so that these people can arrange their own programs to integrate with ours. We make a national appeal, and all our advertising is aimed at bringing people to Canada. We leave to the provinces, and to the transportation interests which I have spoken of, the job of getting people to come to some special area in Canada. For instance, Mr. Garland, you are from Ontario, and

we leave to Ontario the job of getting people into, say, Nipissing and that area, and in the same way we leave to the province of British Columbia the job of getting people to go into the Victoria area or the great mainland areas of that province.

Mr. GARLAND: Do I understand that a master plan is presented to this conference?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, every year we present what may be termed a master plan —where we are going to spend the money. Sometimes we guess how much money we will have available. We have been able to satisfy our associates in this country that it is a good program. In fact there is real co-operation between the provinces and ourselves and also with the transportation interests. Our whole advertising program is based on that. We do no advertising in Canada, as the minister has said, for obvious reasons. We spend all our money in the United States. That is the big travel market we have. 97 per cent of the people who come to Canada for vacations come from the United States. Traffic from overseas, even from the Caribbean Islands, is very small, so we concentrate our entire advertising in the United States where we know we get the most dollars and the most people.

Mr. GARLAND: I think the main item here relates to staff—page 438—and on page 439, publications. This represents an item of $181,000. I wonder if we can have some explanation on that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: On what?

Mr. GARLAND: On that item "publications".

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: For instance, you have the book I distributed two weeks ago, "Vacations Unlimited". Five hundred thousand copies of this are being printed, and the expenditure in 1955-56 will be $110,000 out of the total of $181,000.

In addition there are the following items:

600,000 Canada-United States road maps	$32,000
75,000 copies of "Rod and Reel"	$6,000
100,000 copies of "Canada in Wintertime"	$5,800
500,000 copies of a booklet "How to enter Canada"	$6,000
10,000 copies of "Canada Game Fields"	$1,000
50,000 copies of booklet entitled "Angling Regulations"	$2,200
75,000 copies of a booklet called "Alaska Highway"	$3,000
500,000 Vacation Rock Folders	$15,000

That makes a total of $181,000.

Mr. GARLAND: I wonder if perhaps the minister would prefer to answer this question. It would seem from the figures perhaps that we are at a "constant pitch" in this department. Approximately $1 million is being spent on advertising, which is the same as last year, and I presume this figure has been the same for some time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Since the Korean war. We froze the expenditure of certain branches, and this is one which has been frozen.

Mr. GARLAND: Having in mind competition from other countries for the tourist dollars, would you care to express an opinion on whether this expenditure might be increased?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It might have a good effect if it was increased, but on balance it has not been found possible to increase it in view of the overall expenditure of the government.

Mr. GARLAND: In your discussions at your annual conference, which were referred to earlier, has there been much pressure to have this amount increased?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: I wonder whether Mr. Dolan would care to make just a brief comment on the prospects for the coming year.

Mr. DOLAN: It is always dangerous to make a prophesy about these matters. I am not certain about what is going to happen tomorrow, much less am I certain of what may happen this tourist season. But everything we see now points to a fairly prosperous tourist year in 1955. We have had two very good years in 1953 and 1954. We broke all records in 1953 in the number of people who came to Canada and in the amount of money which they spent, and in 1954 we had our second biggest year. There was a very small reduction in the number of people who came to Canada. Our advertising this year is drawing a substantial number of inquiries, and I wonder say, off hand, taking a chance, that we will have pretty nearly as good a year in 1955 as we had in 1954 if our dollar parity with the American dollar keeps at its present rate. Indeed, we may find the year a little better in 1955 than it was in 1954, but it is dangerous to prophesy in such matters, as the weather is an important factor in its influence on tourists. I am hoping we shall have better weather this year than we had last year.

Mr. GARLAND: Inquiries from the public are really your barometer?

Mr. DOLAN: It is the best barometer we have. Yes, that is our barometer, because when the people are responding to our advertisements in large numbers we have the idea there must be a close interest in Canada. We also get representations from automobile clubs and the transportation companies. Every day somebody is writing me from the United States and the associations we have there telling us what the travel market is like, and most of the reports we receive show optimism for 1955.

Mr. GARLAND: Are they as good as last year?

Mr. DOLAN: The inquiries are a bit down in number to what they were a year ago. About the time we started our advertising a year ago there was quite a feeling in the United States in travel circles that we were faced with a bit of recession and they were not as optimistic about travel as our inquiries would indicate. This year it is the opposite. Our inquiries are not quite as large, although they are substantial, yet our reports from travel organizations are more optimistic than they were a year ago.

Mr. GARLAND: This is perhaps a complicated question, but in certain areas last year there was a recession in the United States, particularly in the Detroit area. The automobile industry there was depressed and naturally the subsidiary industries were to some extent also depressed. Do you have any means of shifting your advertising, or your selling attack if you want to call it that, to other areas?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. We did that this year, Mr. Chairman. We took a number of magazines and newspapers off our list of media in the hope that we would tap those areas where we think there is a better dollar earning capacity. Selected media advertising is a pretty delicate thing. You might one year select a list which would draw a great many inquiries and a lot of business, and the next year the same media might not bring such a good return. We keep on top of that and try to shift our media year after year. We have a basic list we have used over the long period of years and I think it is a pretty good list. Most of the other organizations in Canada take our list as a basis for advertising.

Mr. GARLAND: Is it a fact that you are shifting it this year?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: I notice that there are two offices listed, in New York and Chicago. Would you care to comment on the activities of those offices?

Mr. DOLAN: Our office in New York I think is in its fourth year of operation and we opened the office in Chicago last fall. Both of them we think have been of extreme benefit to the tourist trade. I think that the return from the investment made in those two offices has been exceptional. If you go to any of the large centres like New York, Chicago, or San Francisco you will find that practically every nation which is doing any travel advertising has expensive travel offices and Canada, to meeet that competition, simply had to open these offices. They have been very profitable.

Mr. GARLAND: Is it your intention, governed by the amount of money available, to open up new facilities?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: If we have the finances available.

Mr. GARLAND: I think that is something which should be given very active consideration in view of what Mr. Dolan has said with respect to the results being very gratifying in the two offices which have been opened. I think that competition for the tourist dollar, or whatever you may call it, will be keener perhaps in the years which lie ahead and we want to expand.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I believe that the competition has been keener and we can expect that it will continue to be. I agree with you but we are limited in the amount of the appropriation by the overall obligations of the government. In certain fields we have to remain at a standstill. We did at least for this year.

Mr. GARLAND: I hope that there wil be a more generous attitude towards the development for another year.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I suppose that the visitor belt could be described as the 100 miles north of the United States border. Does the tourist bureau have anything to do with respect to road inspection or road facilities? So many tourists do travel along the roads.

Mr. DOLAN: That is entirely within the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: However, you do give out maps?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, we give out our road maps and some we receive from the provinces. And we do our best to stress the importance of good highways because between 85 and 90 per cent of our traffic comes to Canada on rubber wheels.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I was thinking of food, sleeping accommodation, and roadside parks.

Mr. DOLAN: That would be a provincial matter. All the licensing for that is under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Of course you advertise in American magazines?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Are there certain free services such as the Lincoln-Ford Times which has a distribution of about 600,000?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. We have had several articles in the Ford publication. I think Canada last year had more articles in United States publications than any three other tourist areas in the world put together. In the current issue of Redbook you will see an example of our publicity there. We have been very fortunate in that sort of thing and have had close contact with editors of these publications over a period of years. We have, of course, put some money into their cash registers by advertising, but they have been very generous as regards Canada and there is hardly a week that you will not see a travel article in some magazine.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: The Saturday Evening Post was running a series on cities.

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. Some Canadian cities appeared in that series. It was started by a man named George Sessions Perry. Montreal, Vancouver and I think Ottawa appeared in that.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I notice that you use the R.C.M.P. a lot which is very interesting and very good propaganda. I suppose that there is difficulty in going too far in that respect.

Mr. DOLAN: We use a little insignia of the Mounted Police, because I think most people in the United States know more about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police than anybody else in the country. The United States people are very emotional with regard to the R.C.M.P. and every year our files are filled with letters from girls who want to meet the Mounted Police.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Does that help recruiting?

Mr. DOLAN: It may for the force, but I do not know what it does for the American girl. I never followed it up that far.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: At the present time July 1 is built up by Canadians and as it is followed very closely by July 4 perhaps the two celebrations could be combined.

Mr. DOLAN: In several places along the border that has been done for years. If I may refer to my own native province, the province of New Brunswick, along the border the towns celebrate both those holidays together every year.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I might say that the advertising is very well planned but perhaps not too often well executed. However, that may be a personal opinion. But there is an item in the report at page 110 in the amount of $931,351 as the total cost of advertising. Do the provinces share in the cost of advertising at all?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. This is the federal advertising program.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I think you have already explained that there is considerable cooperation in the federal-provincial tourist field?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Do you advertise very much in the United Kingdom?

Mr. DOLAN: No. We have not advertised there because the monetary policies of the British Isles do not provide much money for a traveller to come out to this country as a vacationist. We have such a fine market in the United States and so much competition there that we need every dollar we have to solidify ourselves in the market which is the most profitable for us.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: On page 111 of the report there is a very interesting sentence. I do not want to read too much of it:

> "The third production, planned to depict the experiences of visitors touring Canada by private plane . . . ."

I am afraid that with the condition of our airports, namely at Dorval and Malton, there will be very few private planes coming to this country, but if you go to the States I am sure you know that private planes are increasing in growth.

Mr. DOLAN: Last year we had for the first time the great organization of farmers who have their private planes and they were so pleased with their first visit to Canada that they are now planning two visits to Canada, one in Alberta, and I think the other in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That would be the western farmers?

Mr. DOLAN: Mostly in the southwest and southern parts. They use these planes in their own work. They came last year in 36 planes and this year are bringing 40 or 50 planes. I do not know what they thought of our airports, but they were well pleased with the way they were treated.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I might say that the reception which they would get at Dorval and Malton might discourage them from coming to this country.

The CHAIRMAN: There is plenty of room for them to land in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: You have already mentioned your offices in New York and Chicago and I have seen them and they are doing good work. You must have heard of the proposition to build a Canada House by private interests in New York.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: And to have the government offices there. As far as I am concerned I would think that that would be one very good means of doing it, particularly as New York City is such a centre of tourist industry, radio, television and everything else.

I suppose that you get less result from the money which you spend on advertising now than you did three years ago because of increased costs and so on?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. Advertising costs have gone up quite substantially as a matter of fact. In some instances we are now getting about 15 or 20 per cent less space for the money we are spending now than we did two or three years ago. The increase in rates, for instance, in newspapers in the last two years has been approximately 36 per cent. In the magazines the increase in rates from 1951 to 1954 has been 47 per cent. So we are paying more money for less space than we did four years ago. But that is something which every other advertiser is experiencing. We are not alone in that.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: In effect, you are trying to balance it by your personal contacts?

Mr. DOLAN: We try to do that as best we can. They take a lot of our publications in the United States mainly because the federal government is regarded as quite an important institution in the United States and publishers all like to carry Canadian government advertising. It is what they call a prestige account. We have not tried to delude them of that idea at all. We want them to continue it because we get a great deal of publicity. Americans think a great deal of this country and of our government.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Could you tell me how much the total cost per copy was to publish this booklet which you mentioned?

Mr. DOLAN: 26 cents roughly, if my memory serves me for 500,000 copies.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Who was the printer?

Mr. DOLAN: The University Press Limited of New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They were the lowest bidder.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It seems like a low price.

Mr. DOLAN: It was a tender and one of the best prices we got.

The CHAIRMAN: They did a very good job.

Mr. DOLAN: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: It shows the value of distributing some of this printing outside Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I wonder if I could just repeat some of the figures on page 109 of your annual report because they are so important with respect to Canada's tourist industry. For example, in 1953 you had a record revenue from visitors of $302 million, which is 10 per cent ahead of 1952.

Mr. DOLAN: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: From the United States visitors spent $282 million, and from other countries overseas $20 million. That is an extraordinary amount when you consider the goodwill that should go with it. The entries into Canada were 28 million in individual entries; long stay automobile entries exceed 2½ million; visitors to national parks 3 million and inquiries 434,000 to the Canadian government travel bureau. Now, if you increase it 10 per cent per year as the airplane business is increasing about 17 per cent per year, obviously your budget is a way way too low. It does seem to be good business to me to spend more money to get more money.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I explained that.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I just want to make the point that we are spending a lot of money some places and where we can see a good return like in this it should be good business to spend it where you can get a good return. It seems to me that we have to step into the United States market and make a frontal attack.

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice this year that there are 8 information officers. What is their particular function?

Mr. DOLAN: They are the officers who take all the inquiries which come in and reply to them.

Mr. MONTEITH: Are they all in Ottawa?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: All the inquiries come into Ottawa, Chicago or New York.

Mr. MONTEITH: How many employees are there in the New York office?

Mr. DOLAN: Three.

Mr. MONTEITH: And how many in Chicago?

Mr. DOLAN: Three.

Mr. MONTEITH: I presume that that would be an administration officer and two clerks or something like that?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, that is what it is.

Mr. MONTEITH: And then I notice that there are four storemen. Just what do they do?

Mr. DOLAN: They are the people who are working over in our small printing room and in our shipping room. You see we have a large shipping room because we carry a tremendous amount of literature and have a small printing plant which prints a lot of our small pamphlets which we can do cheaper by multilith and mimeograph process. The storemen are there and they look after the stores. We will have hundreds of thousands of copies of publications of all kinds in our stores going out at the rate of several thousand per day.

Mr. MONTEITH: In the New York and Chicago offices are all the employees there recruited in Canada?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. With one exception of a Canadian girl who was living in New York who now works for us in New York. In Chicago they are all recruited from Canada.

Mr. MONTEITH: There is the item of "Professional and Special Services". What would that cover?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is the item in the estimates of $3,000. This allotment covers the following: press clippings, $600, cleaning of New York office, $600, cleaning of Chicago office, $500, and matt releases, $1,300.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder if Mr. Dolan could give us any information as to the effect which the Stratford Shakespearean Festival had on the tourist trade commencing in 1953.

Mr. DOLAN: It has been a very commendable operation. Last year I would say that the volume from the United States had increased from 25 to 30 per cent over the previous year. We receive a lot of inquiries about the Stratford Festival. It is something which is distinctive in Canada and is the sort of thing we are trying to promote which is different from anything in the United States, and the Stratford Festival has been a very excellent tourist attraction. Banff days is another attraction. We have many attractions in Canada and I only wish that some of our own people would see more of them.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is of course the Calgary Stampede which is as great an attraction as any.

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. It is a national feature.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mention was made a short time ago of the amount of money spent by tourists in the United States here, but I noted in the press a short time ago that Canadian tourists spent more in the United States than American tourists spent here, and in view of the fact that our population is less than one tenth of theirs it seems that we should get a much bigger proportion in Canada than we are getting. I am not making any criticism of the travel department or the way it has been carried on. I understand that funds have been limited in recent years. But I would like to ask Mr. Dolan what are the important factors or the means, in his opinion, by which the number of American tourists can be increased. Is the fact that we do not get more American tourists generally due to the roads or the fact that we have not sufficient tourist accommodation of sufficiently good quality, or what are the important factors which prevent us from getting two or three times as many American tourists as we get?

Mr. DOLAN: I think that roads are becoming less and less of a factor. Our road program all across Canada has improved tremendously in the last 5 or 6 years. We might as well face this fact, that the premium on the Canadian dollar in the last two years has been one great factor in having our Canadian people travel more in the United States than they ever did before. Our Canadians who go to the United States travel a longer distance. They go to California, Florida or Arizona in the winter. Travel out of Canada has been very extensive. Travelling long distances Canadians therefore spend more per capita than the United States citizens spend. Another thing is we are always competing with every state in the union which spends tremendous sums of money in urging their people to see America. It is a very very difficult program to fight. You cannot complain about it because we in Canada are now trying to do the same thing and have our provinces urge Canadian people to see Canada. The United States citizen spent more money travelling in his own country than any national in the world. The airlines have made tremendous advances in tourist fares to faroff lands like Europe, Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin American countries of South America and in some of these countries they have adopted a policy which this country I hope will never adopt which is a form of subsidy for travellers who go to these lands where they can get cheaper gasoline, lower hotel rates and things like that. That is one of the reasons why Canadians are also going out of the country to Spain and France, the British Isles, Italy and the Caribbean. Those are the factors which enter into the fact that we are spending more money travelling abroad than the Americans are spending here. That and the advantage of being able to purchase $100 worth of goods duty free.

Mr. HARKNESS: What about the amount and the quality of the tourist accommodation.

Mr. DOLAN: The tourist accommodation has been increasing for the last five years, and I think the quality is now satisfactory. In the last three years, we have made great strides in the country, and we have in Canada accommodation as good as you will find in any other part of the continent. Our rates are a little high, but the committee should remember that our season is short and operators may charge somewhat higher rates than you will find in places to the south, but our accommodation problem is no longer giving cause for anxiety and it is improving all the time.

Mr. HARKNESS: In regard to winter tourists to this country, what has been done to encourage more people to come up for winter sports, particularly for skiing, and I refer especially to the Rocky Mountain area.

Mr. DOLAN: There is a case where the national Bureau leaves most of the work to the provinces. I may get in wrong for saying this. There is the area of Banff and part of British Columbia, and there is a small area in Ontario, the Laurentians, and those are the great skiing areas in Canada. Those are the important areas because the accommodation is there. Undoubtedly part of the enjoyability of skiing is what you indulge in after the skiing.

Mr. HARKNESS: I know what you mean.

Mr. DOLAN: Coming from Alberta I thought you would understand that. We leave it to the provinces to do that job of publicity, as the minister pointed out. Besides, if we went into a large winter campaign we would be dissipating a lot of the funds which we need to advertise a campaign which would help all of Canada rather than the areas I have mentioned.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: In addition, of course, you would need a large capital investment before you could get your tourists.

The CHAIRMAN: I have on my list Mr. Jutras, Mr. Garland and Mr. Michener—is it the wish of the committee to endeavour to finish this item before we adjourn?

Mr. DINSDALE: I would like to ask one question with relation to rates. Canada does not seem to have special rates for family travel, and the United States does to a very large degree. There is a problem there.

Mr. DOLAN: I think that is a problem for the transportation interests. I wish we would adopt this way of proceeding. Why cannot we indulge in instalment purchase of travel as is done in the United States? I think this is very important.

Mr. DINSDALE: That applies to accommodation, too. It is very important.

Mr. HARKNESS: Can you point out any book which states the rates in the various hotels and motels and places of that kind?

Mr. DOLAN: We try to keep out of the rate business. We leave that to the hotels. We quote no rates to anybody, and we recommend no special hotels. We try to leave this thing on a national basis so that we shall not get into anybody's hair, and in order that no one should cause us any trouble.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think that the knowledge of what the rates are in a certain area and in certain places carries a lot of weight as to whether people go there or not, and therefore I think it is an important form of promotion for someone to do. If you do not do it, I think somebody else should be doing it.

Mr. DOLAN: We do it in our individual folders, and for instance in the national parks rates are given there because it is part of our operation. We do not say for instance that the Royal York Hotel or some other hotel is such and such a rate but we say that the rate structure in this area is such and such and let them make their own choice.

Mr. MICHENER: I have a question arising out of Mr. Harkness' comment on the situation between the two countries. We carry on a friendly rivalry I suppose in the tourist business and the balance has gone adversely against us. I think it was $380 million Canadians spent abroad and we took in about $302 million last year. I know that all our governments are trying to do their best, and I know Mr. Dolan's work and we are not likely to be able to give him any helpful advice about it because he is doing a good job, but I wonder if he could form any estimate of the amount the Americans spent in Canada in advertising their tourist business?

Mr. DOLAN: No. But the travel pages in our periodicals are now carrying a great number of American hotels. The American interests are spending lavishly in our newspapers.

Mr. HARKNESS: They do not have any government advertising here?

Mr. DOLAN: No. There is a difference in the United States. The motels and hotels and travel interests spend all the money. In this country the governments outspend the private interests by almost 50 to 1 in travel advertising. As far as promoting Canada's tourist interests is concerned the governments of the country are doing the job.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 333 carry?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw your attention to items 541 and 542 which authorizes the government to loan $1,150,000 to the government of the Yukon for the purpose of constructing a hotel at Mayo Landing and at Whitehorse and for development of a new subdivision adjoining the present city of Whitehorse. We have discussed this before. Is it the wish of the committee to carry these now or to have them stand over until tomorrow?

Mr. MICHENER: Are we through with this department otherwise?

The CHAIRMAN: Except for Forestry.

Mr. HARKNESS: We have to come back for Forestry anyway. It is now 20 minutes to six.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall carry 333, and then we shall go on to forestry, then 541 and 542, and afterwards go back to the administration item. We shall meet tomorrow at 3.30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And 8 o'clock if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister suggests we should meet at 8 o'clock if necessary.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We have scheduled a meeting at 8 o'clock, but I must say I hope it will not be necessary.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 21

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Hon. Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. C. W. Jackson and Mr. M. Lamontagne, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Dr. D. A. Macdonald, Director, Forestry Branch; Mr. J. B. D. Harrison, Chief, Forestry Research Division; Mr. J. H. Jenkins, Chief, Forest Products Research Division; Mr. H. W. Beall, Chief, Forest Operations Division; and Mr. J. C. W. Davis, Departmental Administrative Officer.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

56372—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Benidickson
Bryson
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Dupuis
Garland
Habel
Hardie
Harkness
Hellyer
Henry
Jutras
Lesage
MacEachen
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Simmons
Thatcher
Yuill—26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, April 1, 1955.

The Special Committee on Estimates begs leave to present the following as its

THIRD REPORT

Your Committee has considered and approved items numbered 293 to 333 inclusive, 541 and 542, listed in the Main Estimates 1955-56 relating to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, referred to it by the House on February 22, 1955.

A copy of the Proceedings of the Committee in respect thereof is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Walter A. Tucker,
Chairman.

56372—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 31, 1955.
(27)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Deschatelets, Dupuis, Habel, Hardie, Harkness, Hellyer, Henry, Jutras, Lesage, McLeod, Michener, Monteith, Robichaud, Thatcher and Tucker.

In attendance: From the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources: Mr. R. G. Robertson, Deputy Minister; Mr. M. Lamontagne and Mr. C. W. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Ministers; Dr. D. A. Macdonald, Director, Forestry Branch; Mr. J. D. B. Harrison, Chief, Forestry Research Division; Mr. J. H. Jenkins, Chief, Forest Products Research Division; Mr. H. W. Beall, Chief, Forest Operations Division; and Mr. J. C. W. Davis, Departmental Administrative Officer.

The Committee considered the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Forestry Branch, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 321 to 332 inclusive were adopted.

Items numbered 541 and 542, relating to the authorization of loans to the Government of the Yukon Territory, were adopted.

Item numbered 293, concerning Departmental administration, was adopted.

Mr. Michener expressed the appreciation of the Committee for the information and assistance rendered by the officials of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

The Committee continued its sitting *in camera.*

The Chairman presented a draft "Report to the House", which was adopted, without amendment.

On motion of Mr. Hellyer, seconded by Mr. McLeod, the Chairman was ordered to present the said report to the House.

At 5.10 o'clock the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

March 31, 1955.
3.30

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we welcome the arrival which makes our quorum. We are on item 321, forestry branch. $114,636. Page 52.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I may say that the forestry branch generally is divided into three divisions. Apart from the branch administration there is the forestry research division, the forest products research division, and forestry operations.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no questions on 321, we will pass to 322.

Mr. MICHENER: I presume the personnel of the branch administration are all here at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, they are.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where are the largest forests under your jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and in the national parks.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it the national parks comprise a lot of valuable timber?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Are they commercially harvested, if I may use that word?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, except in Wood Buffalo park, and there is some cutting allowed to be done by the farmers who live adjacent to Riding Mountain park, because that is their only supply. Of course, the wood-cutting in Riding Mountain park which is allowed is of the old timber and the surplus timber.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that the scattered forests which the department has to deal with, do not lend themselves to the concentration of fire fighting equipment. I do not believe you have much fire fighting equipment.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have in the forests under our jurisdiction. As I explained the other day, we have a warden service, and we have fire fighting equipment. That comes under forestry operations.

Mr. MICHENER: You do not have equipment of the order which the provincial forestry departments have?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not feasible to do that in the federal forests?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is not necessary because we do not have the forest acreage you have in the provinces. Our jurisdiction is only to the extent I mentioned a few moments ago.

Mr. MICHENER: The federal forests are relatively unimportant as compared with the provincial forests?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, Wood Buffalo park as I explained the other day, contains a very good timber stand, and the acreage is pretty large. I do not remember off-hand the figure which was given the other day, but in Wood Buffalo park, there is quite a lot of good timber.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, but it is rather inaccessible, and the Mackenzie river forests are even further off and I suppose they are only used locally.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are, and Wood Buffalo park is mainly used to provide lumber for the Mackenzie valley and especially for Eldorado.

Mr. MICHENER: What would be the total value of all kinds of forests products from areas under the department's jurisdiction during the last year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I will ask Dr. MacDonald, director of the forestry branch, to reply.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD (Director, Forestry branch): The jurisdiction of the forestry branch is limited to the 211 square miles of forest experimental stations. We take some timber off Petawawa, and a limited amount off the other areas. Timber removal on National Parks is confined to cutting for sanitation purposes only, and to serve those who are adjacent to the national park of Riding Mountain. That was at one time a national forest under the jurisdiction of this service. It has passed now to the parks and it has been a centre of wood supply for a great number of years and it would not be possible to alter that entirely. It is under a very intensive plan of forest management, and under the direction of the forestry branch for the parks, and it is managed on a sustained yield basis. There is only enough cut off each year to ensure that there is a continuous supply and any removal there is also considered from the standpoint of sanitation to keep the forest healthy.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You do not have approximate figures?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not have the figures with me. It is something which is handled by the national parks.

Mr. MICHENER: However, no substantial commercial advantage comes from these forests?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Only from Wood Buffalo park, and that is under the northern administration branch. Some figures were given the other day by Colonel Cunningham, I believe, but the forestry branch would not have those figures because the cutting is not done under their direction. They have forest engineers in the north, but the revenue is collected by the northern administration branch.

Mr. MICHENER: What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose of the maintenance of this large forestry branch. If there is no substantial commercial revenue at the present time, is it anticipated that in the future there will be substantial recoveries, or is this purely experimental?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: As I have said many times the accent in the activities of the forestry branch is on research—forestry research and forest products research—and the forestry operations division looks after such things, for instance, as the Gagetown military area where we do forestry work for the Department of National Defence and also under this operations division comes the grants to the provinces for the various services and for reforestation. I can go into more detail when we get to the proper votes.

Mr. MICHENER: I thought we were considering them more or less as we came to them.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No, they are all distinct—research,—forestry operations and—forest products laboratories.

Mr. MICHENER: What I was really interested in was forest management with commercial objects. I take it there is not much of that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is little or none of that except in Wood Buffalo park and that comes under northern administration.

The CHAIRMAN: 322. Operation and maintenance.

Mr. MICHENER: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Let us have the individual items, and then if there is any general question, we can go back to 321.

Forest research, operation and maintenance.

Mr. HARKNESS: I understand that this is the branch which has the bulk of the personnel employed in it. What research projects are being carried on at the present time by this branch?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: "Research is organized under three broad classes: (a) observational research, (b) fundamental research, and (c) applied research, with facilities for the distribution of information by publication of research findings and by instruction, training and technical assistance in the use of new and improved methods and by the demonstration of new and desirable practices.

These activities are conducted under three main sections at Ottawa: silviculture and forest management, forest inventories, and forest fire protection. Also, because forest conditions vary from region to region, there are five district forest offices and five forest experiment stations throughout Canada. The district forest officers are responsible for the supervision of research programs as planned for the areas under their control. These districts are Alberta with Kananaskis station, Manitoba-Saskatchewan with Riding Mountain station, Ontario with Petawawa station, Quebec with Valcartier station, the Maritimes with Acadia station and Newfoundland district.

A five-year program of research has been developed for each district and is being coordinated for the country as a whole. This program has been developed by the division, in consultation with provincial authorities, industry, universities and other research organizations."

Mr. HARKNESS: We do not get out of that any specific research projects which are under way at the present time.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I have given you the general outline. Now I will give you the details.

Mr. YUILL: Has there been an omission, or is there no branch in British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have a forest products laboratory in Vancouver.

Mr. YUILL: It was not mentioned.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is in the other division.

Mr. HARKNESS: Too many divisions.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The work has to be organized on a functional basis.

Mr. YUILL: You have mentioned all the rest of Canada, but you did not say anything about Vancouver. Do they take in the same work as they do over here?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The forest products laboratory is on the university campus at Vancouver. The Department of Public Works has estimates for a new building this year at a cost of $1 million. So I do not think British Columbia can complain.

Mr. YUILL: No, I do not think that. I was just wondering why British Columbia—

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There are only two laboratories in Canada, one in Vancouver and one in Ottawa.

Mr. YUILL: Well, those are the two important places.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The principal tasks making up the silviculture and management program, that is, the present program, are as follows:

(1) Forest Classification—Development of satisfactory systems for classifying forest, cover types and forest sites. (2) Ecology and Silvics—Determination of the characteristics of different tree species, and the way in which these species react to their environment. (3) Applied Silviculture—The development of methods of cutting forests, of different types and growing on different sites, which will ensure adequate regeneration of desirable species and high yields per acre. (4) Growth and yield—Development of improved methods of measuring the growth and yield of forests grown under Canadian conditions. This also includes new methods of measuring volumes of wood in individual trees. (5) Reforestation and Tree Breeding—Development of improved strains of trees species which will produce trees of rapid growth and good quality, and which will be resistant to the attack of insects and tree diseases. (6) Forest Management—Improvement of methods of organizing forest data into plans of regulation and silviculture for forest areas, which will be suitable to different management objectives.

*Field Research Program for 1955-56**

The principal tasks being undertaken in the different districts during 1955-56 are necessarily limited by local conditions and personnel available to carry out the work.

NOTE: Numbers appearing in brackets in the following explanations of increases and decreases relate to the standard principal tasks undertaken by this Division.

Newfoundland Forest District—

Silviculture and Management—$22,072 (Increase $3,036)

1. Forest Classification
2. Ecology and Silvics
3. Applied Silviculture
5. Reforestation and Tree Breeding
6. Forest Management

General

The increase is caused by the need for provision for new investigations of reproduction after cutting in Labrador and development of a program of controlled cutting experiments in co-operation with the two large Pulp and Paper Companies and the Newfoundland Government. Provision has been made for the employment of an additional Forest Engineer, Grade 2, who will be chiefly engaged in the above mentioned activities.

Maritimes Forest District—

Silviculture and Management—$24,295 (Increase $2,296)

1. Forest Classification
2. Ecology and Silvics
3. Applied Silviculture
4. Growth and Yield
5. Reforestation and Tree Breeding.
6. Forest Management
7. Improvement Techniques

General

The increase is caused chiefly by additional expenditures on development of a site classification system for the Maritime Provinces and the establishment of experimental cuttings intended to secure regeneration in white spruce stands in Nova Scotia. This program is of special interest to the Nova Scotia Department of Lands and Forests.

Quebec Forest District—
Silviculture and Management—$21,148 (Decrease $6,932)

1. Forest Classification
2. Ecology and Silvics
3. Applied Silviculture
4. Growth and Yield
5. Reforestation and Tree Breeding
6. Forest Management
   General

Do you want some more, Mr. Harkness?

Mr. HARKNESS: No, I do not want any more of that.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. What are you doing on some of the more specific things such as this spruce bud-worm?—A. That comes under a separate vote.

Q. I see. We are beaten no matter what we ask. What are you doing in regard hard wood insects in the Maritimes. Is that a separate vote too?—A. It comes under the Department of Agriculture.

Q. Does not your forestry branch carry on any research work in connection with any of these specific matters?

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD (*Director of the Forestry Branch*): That comes under the Department of Agriculture, under the Science Service.

Mr. MICHENER: I want to ask something about the federal and provincial relation.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That would be under the next vote, if you do not mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. MONTEITH: Just a moment. I notice that there is unemployment insurance in this item, after the salaries are listed.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will find this in practically every vote.

Mr. MONTEITH: In all of them?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Practically all.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is that because of seasonal employment?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, casual and seasonal employment, and also full-time employees below a certain salary level, as the employer's contribution.

Mr. MONTEITH: I also notice there is $42,000 estimated at this stage at any rate, which has not been spent. What items does it apply to?

The CHAIRMAN: That is on page 432 of the estimates.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Well, in salaries alone the amount voted was $810,968 for 1954-55; and the forecast of expenditure is $781,250.

Mr. MONTEITH: That is about $30,000?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Then, the travelling expenses were $46,000; and the forecast of expenditures at the time of the preparation of the estimates was $39,700; that is, $6,000 odd.

Mr. MONTEITH: I noticed with respect to the number of employees in this department there is a net increase of four; and there is an increase of eight full time positions and a decerase of four in seasonal positions. Would the minister care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. There has been a new forest engineer grade 2 position established in connection with the tree breeding program and a forest assistant grade 2 position in working in plant physiology, both to be located at the Petawawa forest experimental station. Then there are two additional forest engineer grade 1 positions, which were authorized at Valcartier forest experimental station in Quebec. There is a new position of forest engineer grade 8 which is required at the head office of the forestry research division to assist in research planning and supervision. There is a forest engineer grade 2 who is to be in Newfoundland at the branch there, where there is a very small staff, to make possible, I think, certain additional projects of special interest to the provincial authorities in Newfoundland. A clerk grade 2 is needed in Fredericton, New Brunswick, to assist in typing research reports in the winter months and to work at the Gagetown military area during the summer.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is meant by school fees?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I understand that we pay the school fees of the employees' children who are so remote from a school that they have to send their children to an outside school. Those who are in the field on stations such as at Kananaskis station, which is very far from the nearest school; it is halfway between Calgary and Banff.

Mr. HARKNESS: It is a little more than half way.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, I will not quarrel with you for a few miles.

Mr. MONTEITH: I see there are 84 survey assistants so called. What would they be?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Students in forestry at the various universities in Canada.

Mr. MONTEITH: They would be out getting some practical experience?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is right, and they are useful to us in the summer time when most of our survey work in the forests of a given province is done; we hire those students to help, and the students at the same time acquire a practical experience.

Mr. MONTEITH: They are listed as survey assistants? What do they do?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They participate during the field season in the forestry research activities mentioned in the list I have just read to you.

Mr. MONTEITH: It did not mean very much—most of that list—to me at any rate. It seems to be a very difficult branch to understand.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a specialized scientific branch.

Mr. MONTEITH: There are painters seasonal, painters brush, and seasonal painters spray. I know the difference between brush and spray painters, but what is the difference between painters, and painters brush?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: My guess is that one would paint with a brush, but some would paint with a spray.

Mr. MONTEITH: The sprays are listed separately. There are three classes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You will have to make some complaints to the Civil Service Commission, because these are the various classifications of the Civil Service Commission. They were set up in consultation with the labour department. These are the distinctions which are made by the unions. I am sure the recommendation as to the classifications for these men mostly would be given to the Civil Service Commission by the Department of Labour.

Mr. MICHENER: What about the research work of the department in forestry? Could the research officer here give the committee an idea of how many departments of the federal government carry on forestry research? We know that agriculture does. How many federal departments carry on forestry research, and whether the National Research Council does it, and how many of the provinces carry on forestry research; and how is that work correlated, if at all? I think it would give us a view of forestry research in Canada which we do not get out of these figures.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: This department is the only one which carries on forestry research as such. The other phases of forestry research dealing with forest insects and disease has always been carried on by the Department of Agriculture. It was taken over years ago because that department was handling agriculture entymology. It has since grown into the biological division of the science service of the department.

We in this federal department are the authoritative source of information on forestry research in Canada. The province of Ontario maintains a small forestry research division and so does the province of British Columbia. The research generally carried out is conducted at our forest experimental stations where we have control of conditions. The forest experimental stations provide this, but of course growth of a forest crop may take a hundred years as compared to one or two years for agriculture crop. In all forest research we are working closely with the provincial governments, we do all the forest research for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, and we carry on research in the province of Quebec in conjunction with the research division they have there. We are working with four forestry faculties at universities, and work very closely with the industry, we have a combined project in forestry research with the industry a university and with a provincial forest service; it is of an applied nature and of interest to the big companies.

In that particular enterprise we are trying to apply the methods and techniques which we have worked out for regeneration at our stations, and we have cutting plans which we carry out at our stations. One of the big jobs we have and which is of a long term nature, is the establishment of sample plots which are measured periodically, at five year periods to determine the growth of specific trees, which are labeled, mapped and identified; and we hope we will be able to keep them there for the next one hundred years in order to get information on them.

All such information on growth and yield is passed on to the provinces and to the industries for their use. Research in forestry is absolutely necessary to the companies and to the provinces if they are to have a sound basis and data on which to manage their forests. A difficult feature of forest research is that it is a long term operation, and it is only in the few cases of applied research where we have been able to develop results which have immediate application. That has been done in the case of aerial photogrammetry where Canada was the first conutry to use aerial photographs for forestry purposes. It has now spread all over the world.

Another phase is that of fire protection. The fire research section measures the moisture content of the fuels comprising the forest floor, and combines it with other factors such as temperature, humidity, rainfall, in order to get a table worked out for the different species and different types of forests, so that we can forecast in advance by a day or two the probable weather conditions for fire.

Mr. MICHENER: I am not so much concerned with the subject matter as with the agencies which are doing it. I think you have covered the ground pretty well. It is a fact that the department does the forestry research for

all the provinces except British Columbia and Ontario; and in British Columbia and Ontario there is a cooperative program; and British Columbia has its own separate provincial research organization; and in addition there are four universities with forestry departments which carry on forestry research.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: We depend on them for the training of our research men. They do a limited amount of it in the summer.

Mr. MICHENER: Is their work subsidized by federal grants, or is it subsidized by the provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I can give you the story in Quebec. Our research men are forest engineers. They also demonstrate at the university and the results of their experiments are given to the students. We work very closely with Laval university at Quebec City. Dr. Linteau is in charge of certain federal research in the province of Quebec, and he has his office located in the university school of forestry.

Mr. MICHENER: I think that covers the point. The last part of my question was: what method of coordination was there? Is there any annual or periodic forest research work in the forestry field, do they get together to avoid overlapping?

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: We do that at our annual meetings of the Pulp and Paper Research Organization, and also with the Canadian Lumbermen's Association. We get together there with the foresters annually. We had a meeting in Montreal, in the last week, with the idea of coordinating and finding out what everybody was doing. I there found that we indeed were working very closely with them. Also we have a list of the projects with a number for every project we undertake. A directory is published annually and made available to every organization interested in research, so there is no overlapping.

Mr. MICHENER: That is an annual meeting?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Under the Canadian Lumberman's Association.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: We have set up through the industry an advisory research committee comprised of the members of the universities and of the federal and provincial government, with foresters from each. That is done between Ontario and Quebec under an arrangement.

Mr. MICHENER: I remember the advisory committee which was working in Ontario, and it struck me that they were very useful clearing house for the different fields in which they operated.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: There is one of those set up between Ontario and the federal government.

Mr. MICHENER: They meet periodically. That advisory committee meets periodically and it comprises representatives of your department and of the agencies.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: And the provinces themselves; and we have an advisory committee in the associate committee on forest fire protection set up in the National Research Council which brings together annually foresters from all the provinces and of the industry to discuss fire protection, research, equipment, and all the things involved in it.

Mr. MICHENER: That is under the National Research Council?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes sir.

Mr. MICHENER: What time of the year does that meeting take place?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Usually in January.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there any other general meetings of research workers in the forestry field besides those you mentioned?

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: Not of a general nature; but there is constant contact between all the provinces and our district officers who are in the various provinces and engaged in research work. And in the provinces there is an arrangement with the local industry so that their problems will be helped.

Mr. MICHENER: Have you found in practice that the same kind of work is being done independently in two different places, with one place not knowing what the other place was doing?

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: No, that is hardly possible, the way we have it set up.

Mr. MICHENER: This subject is just about as complicated—the research set up—as we have in this field.

Mr. MONTEITH: In item 328, but I am a little ahead of myself.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: You are getting ahead of me.

Mr. MONTEITH: It has to do with travel expenses of that advisory committee.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is not forest research; that is forest products research.

Mr. MONTEITH: It has nothing to do with the committee which was just mentioned?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. We have two advisory committees, one in Ottawa and one in Vancouver.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. HARKNESS: Where do you get the revenue from? I see the amount of $23,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: What are you on?

Mr. HARKNESS: I am on forest resources division, operation and maintenance, page 262, and page 432.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Just a moment and I will tell you. The revenue comes from timber sales and from rentals of houses which we rent at the forest experiment stations.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD: All the foresters on the stations are obliged to pay rent, which is listed as a form of revenue. The other is for the sale of timber and publications; $75 for the sale of maps and publications.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: $6,000 is for rental of houses to employees; $12,000 for the sale of timber at experimental stations. Take for instance: there has been at those experimental stations some cutting on a sustained yield basis in the experiments on forest management. So, the trees are marked by the foresters who direct the survey and the wood is sold, on the basis of so much for 1,000 feet I suppose, to small contractors. That is the sale of these stumping dues as you call them.

Mr. HARKNESS: Stumpage. I thought you told Mr. Michener that the revenue from the sale of these things came under the operations branch?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. The operations of Wood Buffalo Park, under the northern administration branch. But, this is not a commercial operation, this is only an "à-côté" of this service. "À-côté" means a sideline.

Mr. MCLEOD: There is just one further question of clarification on this. I notice that British Columbia is carrying on their own research and there is no subsidy or assistance. Is this a matter of choice by the province?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a matter of choice.

Mr. MCLEOD: If they asked for help would they get it?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not know. Let them ask for help first.

Mr. MCLEOD: I believe they have.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They certainly have, but not for the purpose of forest research since I have been with the department. I had a long discussion on forestry with Mr. Bennett last summer and he certainly did not ask me for help on forest research.

Mr. MICHENER: They share very largely in the help which is available under the agreements.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, and we have only two forest products laboratories across Canada and one is in Vancouver.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Mr. MICHENER: Where does forest inventory come?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We will come to that shortly.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now at item 323 "Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment, $78,743."

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I suppose that you will want to know the reason for the increase. It is due to provision for six replacement vehicles, four new vehicles and three new trailers. Last year there were only four replacement vehicles and three new vehicles.

Mr. MONTEITH: Have you any idea how many trailers and vehicles of all sorts which there are in the department?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I had that on the first vote. There are 100 for the forestry branch.

Mr. MONTEITH: That is what I meant.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 324, "Administration, operation and maintenance, $184,760."

Mr. MONTEITH: There is one item here, "Films, Firefighting and Prevention". Is there a program of education underway there?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. As I mentioned a few moments ago there is a program of education in forestry and there is an education section in the forestry operations division. This section with a staff of three, arranges for the production and distribution of forestry technical publications, exclusive of those of the forest products laboratory, and of publications, posters, photographs and films related to forest fire protection and conservation in general. As to the films, there is an expenditure of $8,500 this year which is to provide for a 16 mm. colour film entitled "Organization of Forest Firefighting Troops." It is the third in a series of training films used by industry and firefighting units. It is at a cost of $8,500 which includes 12 copies of the film.

Mr. MONTEITH: These films are sent around free?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 325. 'Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment, $154,265".

Mr. MICHENER: What is the new project?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Camp Gagetown.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there important timber there?

Mr. MACDONALD (*Director of the Forestry Branch*): The area is 430 square miles and 85 per cent of it is under forest cover.

Mr. MICHENER: There will be a substantial revenue out of that?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, there will be in time, it is expected.

Mr. MONTEITH: May I ask a question on vote No. 324, the previous item which has been carried. There is a lapse vote of some $22,000 on an estimate of over $179,000. I am wondering why that was underspent?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: My officials will try to give you the answer. I cannot off-hand because two votes have been put together in the book which was prepared for my own information and I just cannot give the figures to you now but I will have the officials prepare the answer.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do you think the estimates book is correct but that you cannot find the particulars?

Mr. MONTEITH: There is one further question on that item. I notice the actual expenditure for the year 1953-54 is $93,756 and the estimate is $184,000 which is practically an increase of 100 per cent in two years.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is the operation and maintenance of Camp Gagetown.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on item 325.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The increase of $130,000 there is mainly for Camp Gagetown—buildings. The organization of Camp Gagetown area commenced only in 1954.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am still on item 324, Mr. Minister. On page 434 at the top the actual expenditure for the year 1953-54 is $93,756. Is that what you are referring to?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. In 1953-54 there were no operations at Camp Gagetown. The operations started in 1954-55.

Mr. MONTEITH: I see.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: And they are increasing.

Mr. HARKNESS: But, the Gagetown operations are under the next item.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. The operation and maintenance is under 324, but the building, construction and equipment is under 325.

Mr. MICHENER: That is a pretty substantial building there. Is it to house the forest management?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is the headquarters and three ranger stations. At the headquarters we have to build an administration building at a cost of $14,000, a storage garage for 7 vehicles at a cost of $11,000, a storehouse and carpentry shop at a cost of $6,000. A bunkhouse at $11,000, a cookhouse and garage, workshop and residence for the chief engineer, and central heating plant all of which amount to $80,000; and then there is $22,000 for the buildings at each of the three ranger stations for a total of $66,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Then the personnel involved, covered in the previous item, would be quite substantial?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: At Camp Gagetown?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Of a total of 47 employees for these forestry operations there are 31 at Camp Gagetown.

Mr. HARKNESS: How was it that there were 48 the year before, before you had Camp Gagetown?

The CHAIRMAN: That is page 433.

Mr. HARKNESS: There were 48 the year before.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, there were 48. What is the question?

Mr. HARKNESS: You said that of these 47, 31 were at Camp Gagetown.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, but I said the operations at Camp Gagetown started in 1954-55. There were no operations in 1953-54. Now, you are making the comparison between 1954-55 and 1955-56.

Mr. HARKNESS: You had these 31 people there then right along?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where have they been staying before these buildings were put up?

Mr. MACDONALD: Of that 31, 19 were seasonal employees during the summer months and they were all quartered in farmhouses on or adjacent to the area before the new establishment was set up.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 325 carry?

Carried.

Item 326, "To provide for contributions to the provinces for assistance in forestry inventory and reforestation in accordance with agreements that have been or may be entered into by Canada and the provinces, $1,225,000."

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Seven provinces have signed agreements for the Canadian forest inventory at 50 per cent, and six have signed agreements for reforestation where we pay 20 per cent. Quebec and Newfoundland have not signed any agreement either for reforestation or for inventory. Prince Edward Island has no agreement for inventory. Alberta and New Brunswick have no agreement for reforestation.

Mr. THATCHER: Ther is nothing there on Saskatchewan at all?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Saskatchewan has both. I was only naming those that have no agreement.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: The province of Quebec does not appear in the list?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: No. They have signed no agreement for inventory nor for reforestation.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Was Quebec offered the same grants as the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: These grants or contributions by the federal government are made under the Canada Forestry Act which applies to all Canada—to any province which wishes to sign an agreement and obtain a contribution of 50 per cent to make an inventory and 20 per cent for reforestation purposes.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Did Quebec decline?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They did not apply.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Were they offered the chance?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Every province was offered. The Canadian Forestry Act is still in force, and the Canadian Forestry Act itself is an offer.

Mr. MICHENER: I noticed in the report that these agreements run until 1956.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: And I suppose the object is to finish an inventory of all the forests in this province.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In five years, Mr. Michener; this is a five-year program if an agreement has been signed with a province for inventories.

Mr. MICHENER: It must be pretty well on its way.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It started in 1952-53, and it is going pretty well.

Mr. MICHENER: When this is done we shall be able to know what quantity of timber we have on every stand of merchandisable timber.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We will not be able to tell for Quebec.

Mr. MICHENER: I mean in the provinces which are participating.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They are 72 per cent complete just now.

Mr. MICHENER: And this is being done by aerial survey?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: By aerial survey checked on the ground. A very interesting process.

Mr. MICHENER: I remember it being done in Ontario. It is a very big item to survey a large forest area, even by air.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes it is. In addition a spot check is made on the ground of the findings made from the air.

Mr. THATCHER: I am interested to know why Quebec would not come into this.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Ask Mr. Duplessis or Mr. Bourque, Minister of Lands and Forests, Quebec.

Mr. THATCHER: Are they doing this on their own?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I am told informally they are doing an inventory and I am also told informally that they think this method of aerial survey does not suit the province of Quebec.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Some reason, anyway.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder whether the aerial surveys are now being made entirely by Canadian companies. I think that in the past we had to go outside of Canada to get assistance to make surveys.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have no American contractors. The first survey in Ontario was carried out by an English company.

Mr. MICHENER: I was wondering if we had developed facilities in Canada to do this work ourselves.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: We have three or four good companies.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we come to the item about buildings now and hear about this decrease?

Mr. R. G. ROBERTSON (*Deputy Minister*): With regard the question by Mr. Monteith concerning under-expenditure in Vote 324, the figure in the "blue book" is an estimate as of last October when the book was put together. The latest figure shows an under-expenditure of $33,629, made up as follows: salaries and wages, $18,540—that is because rangers provided for camp Gagetown were not actually appointed for the whole of last year. They were engaged late in the year but not for a large part of it. Travelling expenses, $2,165; publication, $2,400.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: These are two items about which the Conservatives usually complain.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Repairs and upkeep of buildings and works, $1,000. Repairs and upkeep of equipment $4,600; electricity $1,350, and a number of items scattered over other primaries from $50 to $700-odd.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 327. To provide for a contribution to the province of New Brunswick for assistance in a program designed to combat the spruce bud worm infestation in accordance with an agreement entered into by Canada and the province.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that bud worm is being nipped in the bud because you do not want as much money this year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It depends on the acreage which is covered. As you know this spraying operation is financed this way—Forest Protection Limited contributes one-third of the cost, the province of New Brunswick contributes one-third, and the Federal Government one-third, under a special arrangement. The acreage covered last year resulted in an expenditure of approximately $1,000,000. We provided for an expenditure of half a million dollars but Mr. Vernon Johnson, the president of Forests Protection Limited, informed me that this year they would not cover as much acreage as last year.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Will the minister tell us how much has been paid to date on this project?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: In 1953-54 there were 1,800,000 acres sprayed. The federal share was $1 million. In 1954-55 it was 1,100,000 acres, and the estimated expenditure so far as the federal government is concerned is between $300,000 and $400,000 total. The project for 1955-56 is approximately one million acres.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: About the same as last year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: A little less.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Has any report been received on the effect of this spraying on fish life in rivers joining the areas which have been sprayed, or has no complaint been made?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Complaints would not be made to us, but to the government of New Brunswick, because the assistance we give is not direct assistance to the various projects, but to the province of New Brunswick. Unless, of course, the Department of Fisheries here has received protests.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

Item 328. Operation and maintenance $581,030.

Mr. MONTEITH: I wonder whether we could have an explanation as to where these laboratories are situated and how the advisory committee works.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. I said that there are two forest products laboratories. One in Ottawa and one in Vancouver. You will agree Mr. Monteith, and I am sure Mr. McLeod will agree, that the lumber which is obtained in British Columbia is quite different in many ways from the lumber obtained from the rest of Canada, and that is why it was felt necessary, and very useful, to have one forest products laboratory here in Ottawa and one in Vancouver which specializes in the forest production of the province of British Columbia.

The advisory boards, to my knowledge, are made of representatives of the lumber industry, of the universities and of the public utilities.

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice this year there is an item in the estimates for $6,500 for special and professional services. There was no such item last year.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is for two commissionaires for the forest products laboratory building here. I told you that at various buildings we would this year pay for the services of the commissionaires, which services have been paid for up to now by the Department of Justice.

Mr. HARKNESS: Why has this cabinet maker been added to the staff this year?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Colonel Jenkins is head of that division. Would you give the explanation, Colonel Jenkins?

Mr. J. H. JENKINS: Among the prevailing rate staff who assist the technical professional staff, we have a certain number of carpenters who prepare speciments and materials for use in research work. The Civil Service Commission decided that "cabinet maker" would be a better descrpition of the duties of one of these carpenters.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That, I am sure, comes from the Department of Labour.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 329: construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment, $21,770.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to ask a question about the results of the forest products laboratory work, Mr. Chairman. Presumably it is directed to economic use, and the processes and discoveries known to it are made available to all who want to use them. I would like to know if there have been any notable findings in the past year in connection with the use of various products or, shall we say, in the past two or three years, as the result of the work of the laboratories.

Mr. JENKINS: Yes sir. Not in two or three years only, but spread over a longer period. Forest products research has been going on for 30 or 40 years as a federal activity and we publish our results as soon as we can in the form of government publications and articles in the technical journals. Some of the results cover such things as:

Technical information on the properties of 52 Canadian species. This information is essential for the proper utilization of these species and in developing overseas markets.

Development of working stresses and other strength data so that Canadian timbers may be efficiently used by architects and engineers.

Development of improved techniques for the veneering of logs so as to increase the volume of timber suitable for the manufacture of plywood.

Determination of the dielectric properties of Canadian woods so that this new technique for the gluing and shaping of wood may be efficiently applied in the Canadian furniture industries.

Supplying of basic information on the design of wood and fibre-board containers and on the properties of structural timbers and of plywood for use in the preparation of the various wood specifications issued by the C.S.A. for the benefit of manufacturer and user.

Development of improved techniques for the application of preservatives to Canadian species which are resistant to impregnation.

Development of improved methods for the laboratory evaluation of preservatives and preservation techniques. This is most important in view of the new developments occurring in the wood preservation field.

The proving by pathological studies and service tests that wood cut from jack pine trees containing the defect "red stain" will give satisfactory service. This has resulted in a large volume of jack pine trees containing red stain being satisfactorily used for railway ties and telephone poles.

The railroads and utility companies have been using ties and poles containing this red stain—timber which would otherwise have been left in the woods to rot.

Mr. MICHENER: That gives a pretty good idea of the extent of the work. What do you recover of former wood products—sawdust bark, and things of that kind?

Mr. JENKINS: We have done a tremendous amount of work on that, both on the utilization of sawmill waste and logging waste, and that work has been carried out by both laboratories, and in addition we have recently set up a committee, of which I happen to be the chairman, called the Research Coordination Committee for the utilization of sawmill waste for pulp, and it includes representatives from all the provinces, from one coast to the other, and we keep any developments under constant review.

Mr. MICHENER: Is the waste of any sawmill actually being used for pulp manufacture?

Mr. JENKINS: One of the most outstanding developments in recent years has been the increase in the amount of wood which is being used for pulp. In British Columbia a very considerable percentage is being used for the actual manufacture of paper, and in eastern Canada wherever a sawmill is located in a suitable geographical position, so that economical transport is possible, waste from the mills has been used both for paper manufacture, especially, for fibre board manufacture. Most of these insulating boards are made from waste.

Mr. MICHENER: Thank you very much, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. HABEL: Members of the committee may be interested to know that in the area where I live the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Company has a sawmill 20 miles to the east of Kapuskasing at Fauquier, and all the waste of the sawmill is shipped for use in that mill.

The CHAIRMAN: Items 329, construction and acquisition of buildings, works, lands and new equipment $21,770.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That is for the purchase of the equipment which is necessary to conduct the experiments.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried?

Carried.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is there any permanent inventory kept of equipment in these laboratories?

Mr. MACDONALD (*Director, forestry branch*): Every bit, used or condemned, is kept track of. Every item is tabulated down to the last screwdriver.

Mr. MONTEITH: How many people spend their time doing that?

The CHAIRMAN: You certainly get the administration one way or the other.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is a running inventory. We keep it up to date.

The CHAIRMAN: 330. Grant to the Canadian Forestry Association. Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 331. Grant to Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada.

Mr. MICHENER: Perhaps the minister would say a word about that.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. Since 1951-52, there has been an agreement with the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada to provide an amount of money for research. The Pulp and Paper Research Institute is made up of representatives of the industry, of McGill University, and also of two representatives of the department. The reason for the increase is that the institute is to have a new building. There have been discussions with representatives of the Institute which, by the way, is a corporate institution of the industry,

which is the Pulp and Paper Association of Canada which spends about $900,000 a year out of the $1 million which is spent on the research in the Institute each year.

Mr. MICHENER: About nine-tenths. You have to put in the other tenth.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: They needed a new building. We have conferred with them, and they asked for assistance for the new building. Various forms of assistance were considered, and are still under consideration, one of them being an increase in the amount of the annual grant, but it looks now as if that is not going to be the way in which we shall assist them, if we do. A decision should be reached in a very few days, or at least weeks, and I shall be in a position when my estimates are studied in the committee of the whole House to state what form this assistance, if it is given, will take.

Mr. MICHENER: This Canadian Pulp and Paper Institute is another research organization directed towards paper making.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Specialized.

Mr. MICHENER: It specializes in paper making. You have two representatives on the board of the Institute, I understand?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, Dr. Macdonald and Mr. Lamontagne.

Mr. MICHENER: You keep a finger on it in this way. The industry puts up $9 for your one dollar.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: That has been the experience in the past years.

Mr. MICHENER: Is Mr. Fowler the president?

Mr. LAMONTAGNE: He is the president of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. The president of the board of the institute is Mr. Allan, and Mr. Thiesmeyer is president of the P.P.R.I.C.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It stands for the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Remuneration and expenses of the federal member of the board of the Eastern Rocky Mountain Forest Conservation Board, $5,575.

Mr. HARKNESS: This is one forest conservation project which has been, I think, an extremely useful and important project. As far as I know, it is the only important conservation project apart from the P.F.R.A. project going on as far as the prairie provinces are concerned. I notice that the expenditures are cut here, as far as the remuneration of the federal member of the board is concerned by more than half, and the same thing goes right through. What is the reason for that?

Mr. ROBERTSON: The agreement for the Eastern Rocky Forest Conservation Board extends for 25 years, but it is divided into two phases. There is the initial six years phase when capital expenditures were to be made on the construction of roads and fire trails, and that sort of thing, and the major expenditure in that was borne by the federal government. During that phase the federal government had two members on the board, and the province of Alberta had one. That phase comes to an end today, and as of tomorrow we enter a second phase in which the federal government has one member on the board and the province of Alberta has two. As it is now in the maintenance phase, the number of meetings of the board will be reduced, and the activity of the board will be somewhat less than it has been in the past. Consequently the remuneration of the federal member is, by agreement with him reduced, and the provision for travelling is reduced. There are similar changes in other items.

Mr. HARKNESS: Where it says one in 1954-55 it should be two?

Mr. ROBERTSON: No. The other member was Mr. Tunstell the assistant director of the forestry branch.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is no contribution whatever this year by the dominion government toward this project?

Mr. ROBERTSON: No. The capital phase is completed. The only obligation of the federal government now is to contribute when the expenses for forest fire suppression in any one year exceed $10,000.

Mr. HARKNESS: The road that was to be built from Coleman up to Rocky Mountain House is not completed from the Banff-Calgary highway to Rocky Mountain House, is it?

Mr. ROBERTSON: The figure for capital expenditure during the six year period has been almost exactly equalled. The road will be completed next year by the provincial government, but the federal government's contribution of $6,300,000 has been expended during the first six years, as planned.

Mr. HARKNESS: The completion of that road and the provision of these firefighting roads which run off from it, so far as that has not already been done, has to be borne by the provinces themselves from now on?

Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 321, "Branch administration, $114,636." Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 541. This is on page 80, and it is to authorize making of the loan to the government of the Yukon Territories of $1,150,000 for the hospital at Mayo Landing and at Whitehorse.

Mr. HARKNESS: Who is that being made to?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: It is a hospital at Whitehorse, Yukon Territories with a bed capacity of 120 adult beds and 30 bassinets at an estimated cost of $3 million. This is going to be met from moneys to be provided in the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare up to a total of 75 per cent thereof, and the balance of 25 per cent is going to be met by the government of the Yukon Territories by raising a loan from the federal government through moneys provided in the estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, such loan will be amortized with interest over a period of 30 years. The amount is one quarter of $3 million, that is to say, $750,000. The additional $400,000 is on the same basis for a 20 bed general hospital at Mayo Landing also in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. HARKNESS: What rate of interest is charged on this?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The current rate of federal borrowing.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 542 is another loan of $780,000.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The government will enter into an agreement with the government of the Yukon Territory for a loan of $780,000 to the government of the Yukon Territory to finance the development of the city of Whitehorse across the river where the new hospital is to be constructed. As you know, the city of Whitehorse cannot expand on the left bank of the Yukon river. The only way to expand it is to go across the river.

Mr. HARKNESS: And that big bridge vote which we put through yesterday is for the bridge across the river?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. It will lead to this new townsite where the hospital is to be built. This amount of $780,000 is to develop the townsite with water works, sewers, the laying of streets, etc.

Mr. MICHENER: That is a loan also?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes, on the same basis and at the current rate of federal borrowing. It is going to be made to the Yukon Territorial government which in turn will lend the money to the city of Whitehorse.

Mr. MICHENER: Mr. Chairman, the minister here is a better collector than the Minister of National Health and Welfare and that is why the loan is made in this department since they are more likely to get it back; I am speaking of the hospital loan.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Now, the general administration item of the department, item 293. Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Mr. MICHENER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister about the advisory committee of the northern development. Is it a real functioning organization?

Hon Mr. LESAGE: Yes. They meet each month. The education program that I announced was approved by the main advisory committee on nothern development. It is made up of senior civil servants.

Mr. MICHENER: It is entirely within the service?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Entirely inter-departmental. The Deputy Minister of National Defence, the Deputy Minister of Health, etc—.

Mr. MICHENER: I thought it might be a committee of civilians.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: There is such a committee on Eskimo affairs where you have members of various departments and also members of the two churches mainly interested in Eskimos, the Anglican Bishop of the Arctic and the Catholic Bishop, and a representative of the Hudson's Bay Company etc.—

Mr. MICHENER: This is an interdepartmental committee.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: The Advisory Committee on Northern Development is, yes, at senior level, at the level of deputy ministers.

Mr. MICHENER: And they meet monthly?

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Yes. It is extremely active.

Mr. MICHENER: My experience as a minister is that advisory committees often get in the minister's hair.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: I do not have that experience with that committee, Mr. Michener. My experience there has been as good as the experience I have had with the committee composed of you gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: This completes the consideration of the estimates of this department.

Now we are ready to consider our third report and we will go into camera to do that.

Mr. MICHENER: Before we go into camera let me thank the officials of the department who have appeared before us for the assistance they have given the committee in its work.

Mr. HELLYER: I heartily concur on that.

Mr. MACLEOD: I also agree with what Mr. Michener has said.

(The Committee continued in camera)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 22

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, Treatment Services; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

56374—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey-North*)	Enfield	MacLean
Brooks	Garland	Macnaughton
Bryce	Habel	McLeod
Byrne	Hanna	Michener
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)	Hellyer	Monteith
Cannon	Jutras	Power (*St. John's West*)
Churchill	Lapointe	Robichaud
Deschatelets	MacEachen	Yuill
Dupuis		

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

ERRATA

Proceedings No. 19, March 29, 1955

Pages 629 and 679: Statements and questions attributed to Mr. Yuill, M.P. are those of Mr. McLeod, M.P.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

MONDAY, April 4, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. MacLean be substituted for that of Mr. Dinsdale; and

That the name of Mr. Brooks be substituted for that of Mr. Harkness on the said Committee.

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Lapointe be substituted for that of Mr. Lesage; and

That the name of Mr. Enfield be substituted for that of Mr. Henry; and

That the name of Mr. Bennett (*Grey North*) be substituted for that of Mr. Benidickson; and

That the name of Mr. Byrne be substituted for that of Mr. Simmons; and

That the name of Mr. Hanna be substituted for that of Mr. Hardie; and

That the name of Mr. Cameron (*Nanaimo*) be substituted for that of Mr. Bryson; and

That the name of Mr. Bryce be substituted for that of Mr. Thatcher on the Special Committee on Estimates.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

56374—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1955.
(28)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett (*Grey North*), Brooks, Bryce, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Churchill, Dupuis, Enfield, Garland, Habel, Hellyer, Jutras, Lapointe, MacLean, Macnaughton, McLeod, Michener, Power (*St. John's West*), Tucker, Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Veterans Affairs: Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, Treatment Services, and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

The Committee considered the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Veterans Affairs Department, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Item numbered 510 was called and allowed to stand.

The Minister presented and explained three charts to illustrate the administrative set-up of the Department.

Item numbered 511—District Services—was considered and adopted.

Item numbered 512—Veterans' Welfare Services—was considered.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Thursday, April 21.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1955.
3.30 P.M.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen. I see a quorum. If the committee will come to order we will start our work.

The estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs are on page 75 and the details are on page 609. The first item is 510, "Departmental administration". The minister, the Hon. Hugues Lapointe, is here with his deputy minister and some other officials. He might wish to introduce those who are here to the committee and then we will take whatever questions of a general nature which may arise out of item 510; and, without passing it, in order to leave open the opportunity for further general questions, we will pass on to the next item.

Hon. HUGUES LAPOINTE (*Minister of Veterans Affairs*): Mr. Chairman, following your suggestion I would like to introduce the officials of the department who are accompanying me here today. On my right here is Colonel G. L. Lalonde, the acting deputy minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, the acting assistant deputy minister; Brigadier J. L. Melville, the Chairman of the Canadian Pensions Commission; Dr. W. P. Warner, the Director of Treatment Services; Brigadier T. J. Rutherford, the Director of Veterans Land Act; and Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director of the Welfare Services. I think that that covers the list.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lapointe.

Who is going to ask the first question to break the ice?

Is it your desire, to take item 511 at once, "District services administration"? If there are no questions at the moment on 510 we can proceed to 511. The details of that are on page 611.

Mr. DUPUIS: Perhaps it would be a good idea for someone from the department to give some details with reference to the district services and tell us about them. How many services are contained in this item 511?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That certainly can be given, Mr. Chairman. I have here an organization chart of the department, the head office, the various district offices and the departmental institutions in these various districts. The same thing also exists for the districts of the Veterans Land Act which are not exactly the same as those of the other departmental operations. These are available for members of the committee and I can have these distributed now. I think this will give a pretty clear idea of the organization of the department and of the ramifications of its operation.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DUPUIS: Has the Veterans Land Act anything to do with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, in some phases of the Veterans Land Act operation they work in cooperation with Central Mortgage and Housing, but the Veterans Land Act administration as such is a completely different organization from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Mr. BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, is it the intention to take the items as they come? The Veterans Land Act, for instance, will be up later.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. It will be easier to deal with them in that way.

If there are no specific questions on item 511—

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the Unemployment insurance offices we have a veterans officer. What is the liaison between these two services and how are they coordinated? Just what is the official duty of a veterans officer?

Mr. G. L. LALONDE (*Acting Deputy Minister, Department of Veterans Affairs*): Mr. Chairman, the veterans officers in the unemployment insurance offices are actually employees of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and do not come under our control. However, their original appointment as such was in the days right after the war when there was a great volume of work in areas not covered by our district or regional offices, because the Unemployment Insurance Commission has offices in many places where we do not. Their work is primarily to deal with local veterans' problems. They act as the liaison between the veteran in that area where we have no office and the department, and at the same time they work for the Unemployment Insurance Commission on other business than veterans' business once they have looked after that part of their duties. They are not under our control, but they do work on behalf of the veterans, and they are all people who have been especially trained in the legislation and the various benefits that a veteran is entitled to. So, while they are employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission they know about our work.

Mr. BROOKS: Does this item 511 have to do with the training services, university grants and those particular services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. That comes under veterans welfare services. This covers the administration part of the various district offices.

Mr. BROOKS: How many districts are there, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: If you will turn to page 2 of the chart which has been handed around you will see there are 19 districts all told including the district office in London, England.

Mr. BROOKS: I wonder if you would give us a breakdown of the staffs in the different districts in Canada and in England?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Do I understand, Mr. Brooks, that you wish to have the breakdown of the number of employees at district offices in the various districts?

Mr. BROOKS: Yes, and the costs in each district.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will start by giving you the numbers. It will be a little more difficult to give you the costs. Newfoundland 50, Charlottetown 27, Halifax 613, St. John 558, Quebec 362, Montreal 2246, Ottawa 240, Kingston 60, Toronto 2242, Hamilton 72, London 1404, New Brunswick 46, Winnipeg 934, Regina 102, Saskatoon 169, Calgary 404, Edmonton 145, Vancouver 1739, London, England 34. That includes everything except the personnel of the Veterans Land Act in those various districts; it includes hospitals and all the personnel coming under the administration of that particular district.

Mr. MICHENER: It includes the 765 given under item 511 as administration in the district services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the total of that?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The total is 12,488.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the entire departmental staff other than Veterans Land Act?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: And headquarters here in Ottawa.

Mr. MICHENER: Which is 663?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, 1,051. 1,051 is headquarters in Ottawa. My figure of 12,488 includes headquarters in Ottawa.

Mr. BROOKS: That includes all veterans hospitals across the country?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Except the Veterans Land Act.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: How many would be in the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. T. J. RUTHERFORD (*Director of Veterans Land Act*): 1,082 at the moment.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The director says there are 1,082 at the present time. I would think that his figures are as reliable as the ones I have in my book.

Mr. MICHENER: The 12,488 I suppose are only the permanent employees of the department and would not include casual hourly paid workers hired locally?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it does not. It does not include the cash roll employees.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there many of that type employed in this department.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is really only at the treatment centres where casual employees are taken in; kitchen maids and that type of labour and some seasonal employees around the institutions.

Mr. MICHENER: In the hospitals I suppose there are quite a number of casual employees?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. That comes under "Treatment services", maids and seasonal employees during the summer.

Mr. MICHENER: About how many casuals would be engaged in the course of a year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It varies between 100 and 125 at all times during the year.

Mr. MICHENER: For the whole of Canada?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could get an idea of how the number employed now in the department compares with the number employed say in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will provide you with the exact figure. I am told that in 1946 it was around 22,000. We have them only from 1949 here and I will get you the exact figures.

Mr. BROOKS: The point I wish to bring out is: has there been any substantial reduction in the staff of the department since 1946?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. It has been reduced from a figure which I think at the peak was about 24,000 down to around 12,000 now.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on district administration?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Under which district do the Yukon and the Northwest Territories come?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Most of that district comes under the jurisdiction of the Edmonton office. There is a part of it which comes under Vancouver because of easier access. It is hard to explain without a map. I think I could provide that, with the exact information showing the precise jurisdiction tomorrow.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How do you deal with people living in those northern areas. Do you send travelling representatives around?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is no responsible supervisor?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. We send people up there.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That means, then, you would be sending district representatives and medical people—what about members of pensions commission? Do they travel in those areas?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Not in that area. I will ask the chairman of the commission to reply.

Mr. J. L. MELVILLE: (*Chairman of the Canadian Pensions Commission*): No The Appeal Boards of the commission are held in Edmonton, in that particular area, Prince Albert and Vancouver, and the policy followed is to bring the men in by the most convenient transportation means before the appropriate appeal board.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Continuing on that subject, Mr. Chairman, can we have any idea of the number of recipients in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories who have come under the department of Veterans Affairs for any administration of this type?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, we have that information. However, I have not got the breakdown figures. Some of them are included in Edmonton and others in the Vancouver district. But I will get those figures, and we will get that breakdown. As far as the treatment services which you were mentioning are concerned and to which you referred a moment ago, Mr. Churchill, these people can get treatment under the "doctor of choice" plan of that territory without having to go down.

I have the figures now for which you were asking, Mr. Brooks. In 1946 the total was 15,940; in 1947, 21437. Do you wish me to bring that right up to date?

Mr. BROOKS: If you would.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: In 1948 the number was 17,181; in 1949, 15644; in 1950, 15,312; in 1951, 14,394; in 1952, 14,074; in 1953, 14,187; in 1954, 14,060; in 1955, 13,561. These figures include Veterans Land Act personnel.

Mr. BROOKS: It is more or less on a permanent basis now?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, pretty much.

Mr. MICHENER: Has the minister any idea of the total number of veterans in Canada who are subject to this department's administration?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, we know the number of veterans. They are all "potential customers" but some of them we never hear about. The 1951 census established the veteran population as being 1,228,300, and to that you have to add a certain number of dependents, because, of course, in a number of cases the dependents come under our jurisdiction.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there any way of establishing what proportion of veterans have become active customers" if you care to use that expression?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You could arrive at it, I suppose. You know the number of pensioners; you know the number of recipients of war veterans allowances, and the number of loans under the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. MICHENER: It would be interesting to have those figures at the beginning of this department's estimates—the number under the pension fund, the number currently receiving war veterans allowance payments, and so on.

Mr. DUPUIS: What are the functions of the twenty officers working in London, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: We can take up that question when we get the answer to this one.

Mr. DUPUIS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Melville could tell us the number of pensioners. —I can say that as of December 31, there were 194,357 pensioners including dependents.

Mr. BROOKS: Is that number increasing or decreasing as time goes on?

Mr. MELVILLE: The number is slowly decreasing for World War I pensioners but it has not begun to decrease rapidly. It is still a slow decrease. The figure in respect to World War II is still rising.

Mr. BROOKS: I was wondering if the decrease of World War I pensioners is off-setting the increase in World War II recipients. Supposing 1,000 died during the year from the World War I group, would there be another 1,000 pensioners arising from World War II to take their place?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes, because our pension liability is still increasing. Our total liability is on the increase, so our increase from World War II is not entirely off-set by the decrease in respect to the liability from World War I.

Mr. MACLEAN: Are Korean veterans an important factor in those figures?

Mr. MELVILLE: Oh yes. I have that figure for December 31, 1954. For those who have had service with the Special Force there are 1,198 disability and dependent pensioners, representing an annual liability of $636,582. The total annual liability at that date was $127,170,479.

Mr. MACLEAN: Do I understand that there is an increase in the number of pensioners from World War II?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was wondering how that happens.

Mr. MELVILLE: There is not one day when the commission is not considering a new application for pensions arising out of World War I. There are any number arising from World War II and we have claims also in respect to service in Korea, and peace time service.

Mr. MICHENER: Can we have the figures which I referred to, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There are 44,916 recipients of war veterans allowance, including widows. Under the Veterans Land Act there are 66,736 veterans settled. It is impossible to say how many veterans the welfare services deal with—they may come in and have their cases attended to and then we do not see them again; the case is closed.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not possible to have accurate figures then with respect to the other principal division—that is, general treatment services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Our hospital population is about 10,000 at all times.

Mr. MICHENER: Are there special figures for the veterans who are dealt with by the Director of Prosthetic Services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. ENFIELD: I might point out that there is a very complete "set" of figures for the institutional services here in the departmental report.

Mr. BROOKS: That is a year behind.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Michener, in the case of the Prosthetic Services the number of patients treated or who report to the department for various reasons—such as fixing of limbs or getting new prosthetic appliances—is around 5,000. It varies between 5,000 and 5,400. As regards veterans insurance the number of policies in force under the insurance plan established after the first war is 12,543. The number of policies insured under the Veterans Insurance Act which followed World War II is 38,690.

Mr. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if I read this diagram on page 2 correctly, there are 19 districts including London, England, and page 611, I think, mentions only 18 district administrators. How is the discrepancy accounted for? Is there a vacancy?

Mr. LALONDE: There are 18 district administrators under that classification, and there is one at Charlottetown. Although his title is "district administrator" his classification is "administrative officer grade 4". So he is shown as an administrative officer.

Mr. MACLEAN: I assumed that this was the probable explanation. It is because the Charlottetown district is smaller. I have one further question along the same lines. District administrators are graded from grade one to grade six. What determines the grade of an administrator? Is it his experience—his length of service—or the size of the district?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Usually it is the size of the district and the responsibility which an administrator has to assume. Naturally, in a larger district such as at Toronto, Vancouver or Montreal, the responsibility of the administrator is very much greater than in a smaller district. That is really what determines the grading.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is it the practice for an administrator in a smaller district to be promoted to a larger district when a vacancy occurs?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. This was done a few months ago when the administrator in Edmonton was appointed to Winnipeg, and one from Vancouver came to Edmonton.

Mr. DUPUIS: Is it time now for the answer to my question?

The CHAIRMAN: Your question came under this vote, did it? I have forgotten what it was.

Mr. DUPUIS: I wanted to know what were the functions of the twenty officers in London?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as I can recall your question, Mr. Dupuis, you wanted to know what the twenty-odd people in London, England, did.

Mr. DUPUIS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a district office in London, England, which looks after the Canadian veterans residing now in the United Kingdom or on the continent in the same manner as our district officers look after veterans here.

Mr. LALONDE: Those twenty officers cover all phases of the administration. There is a district administrator, a person in charge of treatment, officers in charge of welfare, pensions, medical examinations, and of course a sub-staff —a clerical staff—to take care of the senior officials.

Mr. BROOKS: Do they look after war graves on the continent?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The war graves are looked after by the Imperial War Graves Commission, but we have some battle field memorials which are directly under our jurisdiction, such as Vimy, which is looked after by the district administrator in London now.

Mr. BROOKS: Do we not have some people connected with the Imperial War Graves Commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The Imperial War Graves Commission sits in London. The Canadian representative on the commission is the High Commissioner for Canada. We have some Canadians employed by the Imperial War Graves Commission and the administrator for the Imperial War Graves Commission in northwest Europe is a Canadian, but he is not a representative of the Canadian government on that commission. He is an employee. The Imperial War Graves Commission asks the various Commonwealth governments to provide personnel to fill these posts.

Mr. BROOKS: He does not come under your department?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, he does not come under my department. He is an employee of the Imperial War Graves Commission, and the Minister of Veterans Affairs acts as agent for that commission in Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Have we many veterans in the United Kingdom?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The number varies. I think it is around 25,000. But I would have to check it. That is as far as I can recollect.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): My question was purely one of curiosity. I did not realize we had so many there.

Mr. LALONDE: Oh yes, both for the first and the second world war.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be in addition to the figures you gave from the 1951 census.

Mr. LALONDE: No. That would not be included.

Mr. MACLEAN: What benefits are veterans living abroad entitled to in general terms? Or, putting it the other way around, what benefits are they excluded from?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They are entitled to pensions the same as if they were living here. They can apply for their pensions here and be examined over there; and the treatment services are applied in the same manner. They can be hospitalized for their veteran disability and receive treatment in hospitals there through arrangements which we have with the Ministry of Pensions in the United Kingdom.

When I was inspecting that office a year and a half ago my observation was that they did quite a bit of welfare work. They are called upon quite often to do the type of work that the welfare services fulfill.

Mr. MACLEAN: What about the war veterans allowance?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The war veterans allowance is not paid outside of Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what I was getting at.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, they are not entitled to it.

Mr. MACLEAN: What other benefits would they be entitled to?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Veterans insurance; they can get that; there was a great number who were taking training, university training over there.

Mr. MACLEAN: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: But that has practically finished now.

Mr. MCLEOD: I understand that pensioners in the United Kingdom and on the continent get the same scale of pensions which applies in Canada.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They get the same scale, yes.

Mr. MCLEOD: There are United Kingdom pensioners in this country. Their pension is so ridiculous that it is not a fair comparison. But we have nothing to do with that.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They just got an increase about a month or two ago, although I do not think that according to Canadian standards it would be considered as very satisfactory. I have figures here showing the number of pensioners and the amount paid in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

In the United States we have 9,360 pensioners, for a total annual liability of $5,817,428.

In the United Kingdom we have 7,079 pensioners for a total annual liability of $6,012,229. Of course, these again were not included in the number of veterans which I mentioned that had been established through the census of 1951.

Mr. BROOKS: There is no implication that you are paying higher pensions to those in England than to those in the United States for the same disability.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. There are probably more married people in England, and I suppose there would be more dependants. That is why the amount would be higher. The amount varies according to the percentage of disability also.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee will note that if you add these figures to the number of veterans in Canada it would appear there are over 1¼ million veterans. Then the dependants must be added to that number; so there certainly are a large number of people who are potential customers of the department.

Mr. MICHENER: It does not look as though the department has dealings with more than perhaps 20 per cent of the veteran population.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No; generally speaking, as a continuous dealing, I would think it would be more than 20 to 25 per cent.

Mr. MICHENER: Most of them would lead normal civilian lives and would not require the services of your department.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct except as Brigadier Melville said, they are always potential customers; and while every day they are dealing with pension claims for World War 1, there may be cases of veterans who have not been heard of for 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a figure given there as to the average population being treated in departmental institutions. In the year 1953-54 you will see that departmental institutions actually admitted 51,700; and the out patient treatments provided to veterans in 1953-54 totalled 714,000; so that the average number in hospitals at any one time does not really give a picture of the number of people being dealt with by the department.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You may have those who are being treated by outside doctors.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: A veteran is entitled to treatment in one of the departmental hospitals in the case illness attributed to service, but he pays himself if his illness is not attributable to war service.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, unless he is a recipient of the war veterans allowance or is an indigent.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You mentioned a staff in England who looked after the veterans there who are drawing benefits. How do you keep in touch with the 9,000 odd in the United States? Is it simply a matter of correspondence with them?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a foreign relations division in the department which keeps in contact with those active cases, and we use the facilities of the veterans administration of the United States. Most of them contact us directly from the states. But it is not so easy on the other side.

The figure of 9,360 which I mentioned is the number of pensioners, not the total number of veterans.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The United States figure of 9,000?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: 9,360 is the number of pensioners. The number of veterans would be much higher.

Mr. BROOKS: You send the cheques from here?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: Looking at item 511 more directly, what are the services which are administered through the district services administration? Does it

include all the services which the department has to deal with, other than the Veterans Land Act, or does it run the whole range of departmental services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps Mr. Mace, the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, might answer your question.

Mr. F. T. MACE (*Acting Assistant Deputy Minister*): The district administration covers functions other than those carried out specifically by one of the branches. It would include the District Administrator and his immediate staff; the purchasing agent and his staff, the personnel division; the district engineer when the district is large enough to have one; and the legal services of the district.

Mr. MICHENER: I was thinking more of what functions they performed rather than who they are. For example, war veterans allowance is handled through the district office.

Mr. LALONDE: No. It is handled through the welfare services in the district.

Mr. MICHENER: So both the welfare services and the war veterans allowance are handled by the one set of people in the district office?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Does any of the pension work go through the district office?

Mr. LALONDE: Not under district administration. It is under the pension commission vote; and the pension commission vote includes the head office of the pension commission as well as the representatives of the pension commission in the districts.

Mr. MICHENER: But they are housed together, although they are not part of the district services?

Mr. LALONDE: That is right; the representatives of the units which you have on the chart of the head office are housed together in the district, but they are not charged to the same vote.

Mr. MICHENER: Is the prosthetic service handled in the district office?

Mr. LALONDE: They are charged to the prosthetic service vote. The district administration includes only these items of service provided for the general users. You have to make a distinction between the branches and what we call the administration directorates. On your chart that division is fairly clear.

As you see, you have all the operating branches handling benefits available to the veterans, and you have the four administration directorates giving administrative services to the branches. This is reproduced in all the districts.

Mr. BROOKS: Are not the prosthetic services administered through the veterans hospitals?

Mr. LALONDE: Not necessarily.

Mr. MICHENER: In order to get a picture of the situation with respect to the district offices, and of the number of personnel, could we not have under this vote for district services, number 511, the number who come under the other branches so that we can get a picture of how the district office is made up?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will ask Mr. Mace to answer your question.

Mr. MACE: Did you ask for Toronto?

Mr. MICHENER: Anyone which is convenient. I would like to have Toronto.

Mr. MACE: In the district service administration in Toronto we had 94 people as of the 31st of March, 1955. We had 109 engaged in veterans welfare service; 1,826 people engaged in treatment services, and 111 people in the

prosthetic services. We have a very large prosthetic factory at Sunnybrook hospital. In the veterans bureau there are 20; and in the Canadian pension commission, 31. V.L.A. had 167 people but that included the district and regional offices.

Mr. MICHENER: That makes a total in Toronto of approximately 2,242.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: May we have the same information for the Montreal district?

Mr. MACE: The Montreal district has 112 for district services administration; 102 for veterans welfare services; 1917 in the treatment services; Queen Mary, St. Anne's, and until recently St. Hyacinthe; 17 for the prosthetic services; 15 for the veterans bureau; and 20 for Canadian Pension Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the number for V.L.A. at Montreal?

Mr. MACE: We have 86 in the district and regional offices.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Are there two districts, one for Victoria and one for Vancouver?

Mr. MACE: They are lumped together under Vancouver. The district service administration includes 109; the veterans welfare services, 114; the treatment services, 1,384; the prosthetic services, 27; the veterans bureau, 16; the Canadian Pension Commission, 33; and the V.L.A., 127.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Thank you.

Mr. BROOKS: May we not have it for the other districts in Canada? I would like to know what it is in the St. John district. Perhaps you could provide us with a complete list.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brooks suggests that we put a complete list in the record, because it would take a lot of time to deal with each one separately. Is that satisfactory? Agreed. You can prepare it and we will put it in tomorrow.

Mr. BROOKS: You mentioned that at Sunnybrook there are 111 in the prosthetic service. Many of them work in the factory. Is that the only factory of its kind in Canada? Do they supply all the other districts with their appliances?

Mr. LALONDE: There is a factory at Toronto, the biggest one in Canada, and it supplies most of our offices across the country. For some articles it is the only place where we manufacture them. We do have smaller shops for instance in Winnipeg and in Montreal where we manufacture certain smaller appliances. But in most cases the appliances come from Toronto and they supply the other districts. The district shops are mostly for repairs and adjustments, or for the manufacture of boots which must be made to specifications and tried on once or twice before they can be given to the veteran.

Mr. BROOKS: Are these factories operated by veterans 100 per cent?

Mr. LALONDE: I did not get your question.

Mr. BROOKS: Are these factories operated by veterans 100 per cent?

Mr. LALONDE: They are all employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. BROOKS: Yes, but are they all veterans?

Mr. LALONDE: In our prosthetic shops I would say yes.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, I would think so. Most of them are amputees themselves. But of course, some of the clerical staff may not be, such as the girls and stenographers.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There is an item "Director of Finance, Purchasing and Stores, Department of Veterans Affairs." I wondered if you could give us some information about the purchasing of stores, how many people are involved, and what the system is? Are tenders called, and so on?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall ask Mr. Mace because that is the function of his branch of the department.

Mr. MACE: In the purchasing function of the department we operate a central purchasing system which operates primarily for the purchase of supplies and equipment required for the treatment services. We follow the recognized purchasing procedure and call for tenders. The main purchasing office is here in Ottawa but we have district purchasing agents wherever there is a sufficient volume of purchasing. The purchasing of perishables, such as butter, meat, fresh fruit and so on required by hospitals and must be purchased at local points.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: How is the purchase at local points carried out?

Mr. MACE: Exactly on the same basis; tenders are called for.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It is done by tenders?

Mr. MACE: Yes.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: And that would apply to food, medicine, and all the rest of it?

Mr. MACE: As far as medicine is concerned we have a central medical stores right here in Ottawa which handle the purchasing of a large proportion of the drugs required.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That would be stock piling if necessary?

Mr. MACE: We do not stock pile. We just carry a normal stock sufficient to provide the districts. There are certain items which it is more profitable for us to buy in large quantities, some of that we stock here in Ottawa. We also make quite a number of our own drugs and ship them out to our different institutions.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Do the repairs come under that department?

Mr. MACE: No, they come under "Director of engineering".

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: That would again be by tender I suppose.

Mr. MACE: If it is done by a contractor, yes. We do carry out quite a lot of our own repairing and upkeep. We have painters and carpenters and so on on our district staffs.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There is a director of legal division. Would you give us some idea of the duties performed in that division and the number of personnel and how it is broken down and distributed?

Mr. LALONDE: At head office we have a legal division composed of one director, one lawyer in charge of estates, and five other departmental solicitors with the normal substaff. Their role is to control the work of the legal division and advise the head office officials on any legal problem. In each district we have 1, 2 or 3, departmental solicitors and there they carry out the same role with respect to the district officials. They do a great deal of work for the Veterans Land Act with respect to titles and all the legal aspects of dealing with property. I think that about sums up their work. It is straight legal work except that they do not appear in court. The legal agents appointed by the Department of Justice carry out the court work.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I presume that they do a lot of social work too?

Mr. LALONDE: I am afraid that is not quite true. If a veteran comes to the welfare services with a problem which has a legal aspect, our welfare officer will consult our departmental solicitor to get the official view, but the lawyer himself has no interview with the veteran. We are not in the legal aid business.

Mr. BROOKS: They do not search titles for the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. LALONDE: They do in a few places. Perhaps the director might give you the places where they do. It is the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They do in London, Toronto, Montreal and Saint John's District.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Could you give me a breakdown of the legal setup in Montreal?

Mr. LALONDE: I know we have two lawyers. As far as the substaff is concerned I am afraid I do not know. I think that they each have a secretary and that is all.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Macnaughton, did you wish to have the number of people on purchasing?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Yes.

Mr. MACE: At head office there are 35 people engaged in purchasing and in the districts right across Canada there are 87.

Mr. MICHENER: What system of accounting for stores is the practice in the department?

Mr. MACE: That would depend on the kind of stores. There are certain stores which are of an expendable nature, and are charged out as an expense when purchased. On the other hand there are stores which are subject to a regular stores centre. We have a storekeeper in our institutions and he maintains a physical and accounting control of such stores in his custody. His account is also controlled by the Chief Treasury Officer. Everything which comes into the stores is charged to that account and everything issued from the stores is done so on a properly approved requisition and written off stores charge.

Mr. MICHENER: That is on a district basis?

Mr. MACE: Yes. It actually applies to each hospital because there are no no stores in our districts other than the Department of Public Works furniture which as you know is not charged to us. As far as equipment is concerned it is pretty well the same procedure. It is placed on inventory charge and is maintained there on a perpetual inventory basis. Inventories are taken periodically of both stores and equipment.

Mr. MICHENER: Then what is the function of the central control of that system of handling stores?

Mr. MACE: The function of the stores sections in Ottawa is to maintain standards or the requisitions and insure that the districts are not requesting more than they should have. We do not always fill a requisition from one district; for example, we may fill it from surplus stores of another district.

Mr. MICHENER: Does each district report to headquarters and is a control account kept at headquarters covering the store accounts?

Mr. MACE: Control accounts are maintained in each district and are subject to a duplicate amount maintained by the district treasury officer.

Mr. MICHENER: As far as headquarters is concerned I suppose it is just an item of dollars and cents representing the stores in the district?

Mr. MACE: District accounts are reported to head office but figures also come through the district treasury officer to the chief treasury officer and we know what the value of their inventory on charge is at any one time.

Mr. MICHENER: Let me take an example of one type of equipment, automobiles, and see how it is handled. What vote does the purchase of automobiles come under?

Mr. MACE: Under "District administration" vote 510.

Mr. MICHENER: How much money is being voted this year?

Mr. MACE: $63,500.

Mr. MICHENER: What are those automobiles for?

Mr. MACE: They are used by all of our districts across Canada and they include ambulances which we use at the hospitals, trucks and passenger vehicles. I should explain that vehicles are maintained in district pools. In other words, although the vehicle may be required by Treatment Services we nevertheless will buy the ambulance out of this vote and they are controlled by a person in charge of transport in each district. They include ambulance and station wagons for the transporting of patients, trucks and passenger cars of course.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the practice in buying an automobile for the department. How is it done?

Mr. MACE: If the district wishes to replace a car, first of all we have to abide by the regulations which provide that the car must run approximately 60,000 miles. If we are satisfied at head office that a replacement is needed—and that is screened, incidentally, by the Director of Engineering, Accommodation and Transport—it is approved through the deputy minister's office and goes to the Motor Vehicle Committee. In the meantime, we would, of course, have called for tenders from approved agents of cars in whichever district is concerned and our recommendation goes to the motor vehicle committee and they approve the purchase or otherwise.

Mr. MICHENER: Is there a list of approved agents maintained in each district from which automobiles may be purchased?

Mr. MACE: Naturally if we are buying a car here in Ottawa there is a list of the approved agents of various cars and we would call for tenders from a representative number.

Mr. MICHENER: Are all these automobiles purchased locally rather than through headquarters?

Mr. MACE: Yes. For the purpose, primarily, I would suggest of getting good service both on the purchase and subsequent to purchasing the car.

Mr. MICHENER: If a car is needed, say in Toronto, and it is decided that it may be purposed would the agents of all the leading manufacturers be called to tender?

Mr. LALONDE: The agents handling the various types of cars in the low priced field. We would not call for Buicks and Cadillacs; we would call for Chevs, Fords and Plymouths.

Mr. MICHENER: How would you decide which agent would be allowed to tender in a place where there are many agents?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a list of authorized dealers and all those on the list are asked to tender. You may have 4 or 5 Ford dealers. In large cities where there is more than one authorized dealer for one type of car you may have 2, 3, or 4 Ford agents who will tender for the same car.

Mr. MICHENER: We were inquiring into the practice in this same problem in another department and there it was stated that tenders had to be called from at least two of the leading low priced manufacturers and I wondered whether there was a rule of that kind in effect in this department.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that is a Treasury Board regulation.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder what the regulations are? Can the department buy a car cheaper in Toronto than I can for instance? Is that the result of the system, that you do get cars cheaper than the list price?

Mr. LALONDE: We think so on the prices we are given.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We usually get a better price on the trade-in.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Because you buy in quantity?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. They are individual purchases but we usually get a better price.

Mr. BRYCE: Does that only apply to Ottawa, or do you buy at other places?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We buy them locally. If a car is needed in Winnipeg the purchase will be made in Winnipeg and tenders will be made by authorized dealers in Winnipeg.

Mr. BRYCE: An agent would have to get his name on your list before he could tender. If I want somebody in my district to have the privilege of tendering for the car I would have to apply to you?

Mr. LALONDE: The man has to have an agency before he gets on the list.

Mr. BRYCE: That is understood.

Mr. MICHENER: In this idea of an approved list, if there is such an approved list I would be interested in seeing the approved list for Toronto, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Who is the list approved by?

Mr. LALONDE: It is not approved. It has been built up over the years. They have asked for tenders from a group of people over the years and some of them have stopped giving us prices; they are taken off the list because they are not interested. Other people come in and ask if they can tender and they are put on the list.

Mr. MICHENER: There is nothing to stop any local dealer saying that he would like to be considered the next time you are buying a car?

Mr. LALONDE: That is being done all the time.

Mr. MICHENER: How many automobiles are there altogether in the department?

Mr. MACE: 172 in D.V.A. and 117 in V.L.A.

Mr. MACLEAN: I suppose that the reason automobiles are purchased locally rather than from the factory and distributed by the department is that the department has no servicing of its own and must depend on the local dealers for service?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right. The car goes to the dealer for the regular checkup.

Mr. MACLEAN: Has any study been made of the economics of replacing these cars at 60,000 miles. Has it been found that it is the most economical age at which to trade them in?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. This is a directive from the motor vehicle committee. Some time ago cars were driven 100,000 miles before authority was given to trade them in. It was found to be more economical to trade them in at 60,000 miles. The mileage done between 60,000 and 100,000 proved to be very costly in maintenance and repairs.

Mr. MACLEAN: Might it not vary from one part of the country to another dependent upon climatic conditions and roads?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: And on the driver.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: This is the principle, so to speak, but they will approve exceptions.

Mr. MACLEAN: Are car purchases limited to cars manufactured in Canada necessarily?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have always purchased cars manufactured in Canada. If there were requirements for a special vehicle which was not made in Canada—the deputy minister tells me that since he has been in this department there has not been any car excepting cars built in Canada purchased by the department.

Mr. MACLEAN: I may be wrong, but it seems to me that some other departments, like for instance the Department of Defence, use ambulances of a type of car not manufactured in Canada. I wonder if that obtained in this department?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. LALONDE: Our ambulances are mostly converted Canadian cars of the station wagon type taking a stretcher and some sitting or walking cases.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: This seems rather naive, but it might be interesting. There are certain positions here, architect 1, pharmacists, 2, and confidential messenger. What are the functions of those gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN: On what page?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: On page 609.

Mr. LALONDE: The architect grade seven is one of the members of the staff of the director of engineering. We have a lot of planning to do with respect to changes in the buildings which we are using as hospitals, or with respect to planning new buildings for replacement. This architect, while he does not draw the final plans, advises us and prepares what we call sketch plans, on which we can work and determine approximately how much the replacement may cost.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Page 610. I see and item here with respect to pharmacists. Would the minister explain that?

Mr. MACE: They are employed in the compounding room of the central medical stores.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: To keep this department up to date with regard to the latest ideas?

Mr. LALONDE: They are actually doing work as pharmacists. We have found we can save a great deal of money by purchasing in bulk and doing our own compounding.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I see provision is made for a number of ordinary messengers, but that two confidential messengers are also provided.

Mr. LALONDE: One is for the minister and one for the deputy minister.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: You have a confidential one?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We each have one—those fellows who carry privileged documents which cannot be tabled in the House.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Does he get a station wagon?

Mr. LALONDE: He walks.

Mr. BROOKS: I wanted to ask a question with reference to the stores. When there is a loss of stores or when it is decided that the stores are worn out, is there a board responsible for determining whether stores should be replaced? What is the practice in this regard?

Mr. MACE: Each district holds a monthly board of survey. During the month any equipment which becomes broken or obsolete and which has to be replaced is turned back to the storekeeper. It is examined at the end of the month by a committee consisting of the storekeeper, a representative of the hospital management and a representative of the district administrator.

These three gentlemen examine the equipment, make sure it is beyond further use, and make their recommendation on an appropriate form which becomes the basic accounting document for the reissue of replacement of stores.

Mr. BROOKS: What disposal do they make of worn-out equipment?

Mr. MACE: That depends on the type of equipment. If they are dealing with worn-out linen—and linen is worn out continuously in hospital operation—they usually spot dye it and use it for dusters required in the hospital. Other articles might be disposed of as scrap, or, as in the case of broken crockery, which would be of no further use, is thrown into the garbage.

Mr. BROOKS: Is any of this material disposed of by tender?

Mr. MACE: Scrap would be. The minister has authority to dispose of the scrap directly from the hospitals. This would include kitchen swill, for example, which is disposed of by tender in the normal manner.

Mr. MICHENER: I did not quite complete my question about the accounting for stores. There must be an audit for each district periodically.

Mr. MACE: Yes. Annual inventories are taken, except that in the case of certain articles we do permit them to take the inventory at three-year intervals only, though this is now being changed to two years. But this would be in the case of heavy equipment which nobody could very well steal.

Mr. MICHENER: What has been the experience in the last few years in respect to stores? Have there been losses which have required disciplinary action or prosecution?

Mr. MACE: Naturally there are losses, but I do not think they are out of the ordinary. We keep a very close watch on them. I cannot tell you the actual amount of the losses; I can only assure you that they are within reason and constant supervision is maintained to keep pilferage to a minimum. If there appears to be anything which is out of order we take it up with the district and if necessary have our inspectors look into the matter, but I think the losses are pretty well restricted to normal wastage.

Mr. MICHENER: Is the auditing done by departmental auditors or by the Auditor General's staff?

Mr. MACE: It is done in the first case by departmental staff. The initial inventory is taken by an inventory team which is responsible to the purchasing agent. The purchasing agent thus carries out a check on the storekeeper's operations. In addition there are spot checks made by the District Treasury Officer's representative.

The CHAIRMAN: He is in the Department of Finance?

Mr. MACE: Under the comptroller of the treasury.

Mr. MICHENER: I know the operation of hospitals is a difficult one from the point of view of the control of supplies. Has there been any serious leakage?

Mr. LALONDE: Outside of a few cases of small pilfering which one cannot stop altogether—although we are being pretty severe when we catch the offenders—there has been no systematic looting. We are pretty sure of that.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I notice the item with regard to student assistants (seasonal) on page 611 has been eliminated this year. What is the cause of that?

Mr. MACE: I believe we expect to employ them. They are architecture students and work for us during the summer months only, to help our engineering department with their plans.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Where would they be located?

Mr. MACE: In the district offices, sir.

Mr. LALONDE: Actually we had some difficulty in getting the number we wanted last year, and we are not sure that we shall be able to get them this year.

The CHAIRMAN: The question was, I suppose, that if you may get some why have you not provided for them in the estimates?

Mr. LALONDE: They would be casually employed.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask a few questions with regard to the Corps of Commissionaires services,—510 and 511, towards the end of each section. I notice that combining the two there is an increase in the estimates this year of about $27,195. May we have some information with regard to the employment of the commissionaires and the places at which they are employed, and their rates of pay and other things of that nature?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As regards the increase, it used to be that the commissionaires who did the security work in departmental buildings or institutions were paid by the R.C.M.P. They are now paid directly by the department, and that would account for this large increase. Furthermore, effective from April 1 this year, we have entered into a new agreement with the Corps of Commissionaires which increases the rates, and also the amount which we pay to the corps for administration purposes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How many commissionaires are employed?

Mr. MACE: I would like to suggest it would be more appropriate if I gave the committee the number of hours of service we get, because we may have one post which is only operative during the day, for example from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m., whereas another post may be manned twenty-four hours a day. We are not concerned with the number of individual commissionaires. Under Treatment Services, for example, which is the big employer of the Corps of Commissionaires, we are providing for 486,000 hours of service approximately and that includes both the day staff and the protective staff during the night, which we recently took over from the R.C.M.P.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does that apply right across Canada?

Mr. MACE: Yes, sir, right across Canada, mostly in our treatment institutions.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the usual rate of pay—is it the same across Canada?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The maximum basic rate per hour is, and has been from the 1st of April, $1.15. It was raised from $1 to $1.15 effective from the 1st of April, 1955.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You say that basically the pay is the same?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I said that this year the maximum basic rate is $1.15. The actual rate of pay in a locality is based upon the prevailing rate for similar work in that area.

Mr. BROOKS: It would be very interesting to know how many of these old soldiers are employed—

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: By the department?

Mr. BROOKS: No, right across Canada in this particular work. We are more interested in the individual than in man hours.

Mr. LALONDE: We can give you the number of posts which we have, but that does not necessarily mean that the Corps of Commissionaires places one man to cover each of these posts. They alternate them. We could have one post covered by two or three members of the corps, depending on the decision of the corps itself. They may be having 1,000 veterans across Canada to cover 600 of our posts. We do not know that.

Mr. BROOKS: Is it considered as casual earnings under the war veterans' allowance?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It could be, in some cases, if the man were not working regularly. We enter into a contract with the Corps of Commissionaires to provide us with the men to fill the posts. We do not hire the men ourselves, and the Corps of Commissionaires may put one individual to man a post, or they may choose to put three men on it, and alternate the work among them.

Mr. BRYCE: And that is determined by the corps?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We pay the corps, and we also pay the corps nine cents an hour for the administration costs. That nine cents is divided in such a way that six and a half cents goes to the local office of the corps, and two and a half cents to the headquarters of the corps, except in British Columbia where it all goes to headquarters because they have a different set-up.

Mr. HELLYER: Is any of that nine cents used for unemployment insurance or workmen's compensation?

Mr. MELVILLE: I can answer that, because I had occasion in the last few days to arrange to hire a man on behalf of a church in Ottawa. We hired a commissionaire from the Corps of Commissionaires and the rate was ninety-four cents an hour, plus nine cents administration. They told me that included liability for the insurance and the protection of the man. That is a corps responsibility.

Mr. LALONDE: I may say that in the fiscal year 1953-54 the corps itself reported to us that they had given employment to over 6,000 old veterans, but not necessarily in this department. This was the total number to which they had given employment.

Mr. MACLEAN: I notice an item here for 120 chauffeurs and there are, I see, six maintenance men. I do not remember the figure which was given for the number of vehicles, but I think it is greater than that. What determines whether a vehicle must be driven by a chauffeur or by an officer of the department? What is the system so far as the actual driving of cars and vehicles of all types is concerned?

Mr. LALONDE: There is no hard and fast rule. In some cases a welfare officer in a district who has to do a lot of travelling to cover his territory cannot afford to buy a car, so we supply him with one, but we do not need to give him a chauffeur. He will drive that car himself, although it is a departmental vehicle. In other cases we have pool cars transporting patients or staff, and there we require a chauffeur. Of course, we require a chauffeur or driver on all ambulances and trucks, but where an employee doing a lot of mileage wants to purchase his own vehicle and be paid a mileage allowance, we do not purchase a car.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is more or less optional at the wish of the employee. I am speaking now of an officer of the department where he supplies his own car and gets mileage, or has his own car supplied to him.

Mr. LALONDE: It depends on what kind of work he does. If he is a district administrator he can only get a small amount of mileage allowance, because it is not normally his function to be travelling across the country, but a welfare officer or settlement officer, yes.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the allowance per mile of travel?

Mr. LALONDE: That has just been set by the treasury board at eleven cents for the first 5,000 miles.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: And ten cents for the second 5,000 miles and eight cents for everything else.

Mr. LALONDE: That applies to people who are within those classes who travel continuously. Those who travel only occasionally, such as district administrators get a much lower rate. They get seven cents per mile at any time, and those who prefer to take their cars instead of the train get four cents per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN: I notice that in the case of certain classes of employees the amounts are shown in sterling. This applies to employees in the United Kingdom. I suppose the officers of the district there, except the ordinary clerical staff, are Canadians?

Mr. LALONDE: There are two or three who are Canadians. The others are locally employed. All the clerical staff are locally employed.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am speaking of the administrative staff.

Mr. LALONDE: The district administrator, the senior treatment medical officer and the assistant district administrator are Canadians.

Mr. MACLEAN: Are they paid in Canadian funds on the same scale as their counterparts in Canada.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: And the locally employed persons are paid at a certain figure in sterling, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): How do you set the pay of these other people in sterling. I notice it is considerably less than the Canadian equivalent.

Mr. LALONDE: The pay is set by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It is somewhere in between the Canadian and the United Kingdom rate.

Mr. LALONDE: I imagine that the rates that they have set for these employees are the same as for locally employed people in the various Canadian agencies such as Canada House and the Board of Commerce. The Civil Service Commission is responsible for determining the salaries.

Mr. BROOKS: I notice that on page 611 we have three fire prevention officers who are not included in 1955-56 although they are listed in 1954-55. Who has taken over their duties?

Mr. MACE: I think you will find they were transferred to Treatment Services.

Mr. BROOKS: Where would you find it?

Mr. MACE: On page 616. The number is increased from four to seven, two-thirds of the way down the page.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I notice an item "anticipated savings due to staff turn-over". That is on page 612 about half way down. That is something new from what we had last year.

Mr. MACE: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Just underneath "total continuing establishment".

The CHAIRMAN: $50,000.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Has some new condition arisen within the last year?

Mr. MACE: It means that we are making a tighter estimate of the cash requirements for our salaries. We find that with a turn-over of staff we are able to make savings from time to time. For instance, somebody at the maximum salary for a grade 4 may leave a position and be replaced, through competition, by somebody at the minimum of grade 4 and we thereby save

something. Our experience is that it may amount to $50,000 over the year so that we have got our salaries down more closely to our actual cash requirements.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It was not done last year. This appears to be the first time you have done it.

Mr. MACE: It has been done before in other votes but perhaps we have never been as tight in our figuring for this one.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, my book of estimates jumps from page 612 to 621. That ruins somewhat considerably my question on the corps of commissionaires. I wonder if we could have the total amount combined under the various sections here which is being paid out to the corps of commissionaire services. I have only two items and I believe there are more.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, I can add that up.

Mr. LALONDE: $35,165; $62,500; $472,000.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The total amount is $569,655; but that does not take care of the increases which I mentioned and which were effective from the 1st of April, the increase from eight to nine cents for administrative cost, and the increase in the maximum basic rate from $1 to $1.15. So that will call for a supplementary vote.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the total increase from last year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The increase is $224,000 roughly.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the departmental practice with respect to postage? Is the postage actually paid from all outside offices, and franked from inside? Or what is the practice in this department?

Mr. MACE: First of all, the actual expenditure for postage is borne by the head office vote, Departmental Administration. A distribution based on actual usage is then made so that each branch bears its own pro rata proportion of the postage. As far as head office is concerned, we frank all our outgoing mail except for parcels, airmail, and registration fees, which we have to pay for. As far as our districts are concerned, they have to pay for their postage usually through the use of meters except for any letters which are addressed to the deputy minister at head office.

Mr. MICHENER: Has the department any idea of the value of the use of the frank to the department? How much money would be required if all the mail was actually paid for?

Mr. MACE: We did make a calculation some years ago, when it was then thought that our department should pay the post office department for the mail. Quite frankly I have forgotten what the figure was. We have not calculated it for sometime, not having been asked to do so. But if you would like to have it, we could have it done.

Mr. MICHENER: I would be interested if you would look up the old calculation which you made, just to see.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We can get that for you.

Mr. MICHENER: It seems to be pretty general practice in the head offices of departments to make available what it amounts to in dollars and cents.

Mr. MACE: We can get that for you tomorrow.

Mr. MICHENER: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: May we now carry item 511?
Carried.

Item 512 "Veterans' Welfare Services," the details of which will be found at page 613.

No. of Vote	Service	Details on Page No.	1955-56	1954-55	Compared with Estimates of 1954-55	
					Increase	Decrease
			$	$	$	$
512	Veterans' Welfare Services..... Treatment Services—	613	3,284,611	3,291,711	.....	7,100

Mr. BROOKS: It is about half past five, Mr. Chairman. May we not start with this new item tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: There might be some questions which you would want to ask and for which the officials could get the information in time for tomorrow.

Mr. MICHENER: What about the work of the veterans welfare services? I take it that this staff administers the welfare services properly so called, and the welfare allowances, both.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry, would you mind repeating your question please.

Mr. MICHENER: We are dealing with item 512. That item provides for a staff of 825 personnel, being a reduction of about 27 and I wanted first of all to find out what their duties were. I take it that this group in the department is scattered throughout the districts and that it performs special functions, that is, the administration of the veterans welfare service, and the veterans allowance. Is that the whole story, or does it go beyond that?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall ask Mr. Parliament, the Director of Welfare Services, to give you a breakdown of the operations of his branch.

Mr. G. H. PARLIAMENT (*Director General Veterans' Welfare Services*): First of all, we administer what is left of the rehabilitation program for World War II Veterans' Children under the War Dead Educational Assistance Act, which is new, and a rehabilitation program of the Korean veterans. We continue the administration of the War Services Grants Act. Our officers carry on investigations for the war veterans allowance board, and does some for the Canadian Pensions Commission, for the Department of National Defence, as well as for other branches of the department including the treatment services, and the veterans bureau when required. We carry out a casualty rehabilitation service for the seriously disabled veterans, and vocational guidance training, and placement in employment. The active casualty load is some 6,000 from an original load of 37,000 at the peak of our activities for World War II.

Mr. MICHENER: Which of these is the most important from the point of view of the number of personnel which is required to look after it?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: The welfare officer does all of these jobs. We think that the most important one naturally is the rehabilitation of the seriously disabled veteran. I think that has priority; and then comes the investigation which we carry out for the War veterans allowance to get the payment of the allowance, which cannot be done until an investigation has been carried out. This probably would take more time than any other item.

Mr. MICHENER: And that would probably be the most time-consuming thing?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: That would probably be the most time-consuming, and would require a great deal of travelling in some districts.

Mr. MICHENER: That would mean an investigation at the home of the applicant in respect to his financial needs?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: And I suppose there would be a good many collateral inquiries which would have to be made to verify certain things.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: In most cases.

Mr. MICHENER: How many people are classed as investigators?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: There are 300 of this group of 825. There are 368 welfare officers of which the grades of those carrying out investigations are grades 3, 2 and 1. They are the actual people who carry out the investigation.

Mr. MICHENER: How many would there be in Toronto and in Montreal each?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: In Toronto, there are 44; 47 in Vancouver, including Victoria; 43 in Montreal and 24 in Winnipeg, taking in the grades 3, 2 and 1.

Mr. MICHENER: The Toronto group would be mainly concerned with carrying out the investigations?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Of the casualty welfare work and the investigations of the department.

Mr. MICHENER: How many veterans would be investigated by that group last year in Toronto, let us say? How many are in receipt of the allowance?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I have not the Toronto figures. I can bring them tomorrow.

Mr. MICHENER: There are 44,000 altogether in receipt of the allowance in Canada.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Of war veterans allowance alone, the actual re-check investigations carried out in 1954-55 up to the end of February were 31,078 with respect to war veterans allowance for Canada. I will give you the Toronto figures tomorrow.

Mr. BROOKS: Does your investigation include the files, or just a personal investigation?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: A personal investigation and a re-check of the files.

Mr. BROOKS: The application goes to the welfare allowance board?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: The application goes to the district office. The investigation is then carried out, and the result is presented to the district authority in each district for their decision. It is required under he War Veterans Allowance that an investigation be carried out.

Mr. BROOKS: Who is in control of the files? Your branch?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: We draw them from the central registry. We certainly go over the files at the same time as we investigate the veteran.

Mr. BROOKS: It is part of your duty to go over the files?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: It is interesting to know what is involved in making the investigation, and in describing it in detail from the time the veteran makes his application.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: First of all we must establish service in a theatre of operation or a pension. That requires a review of the file. Then we go to the home and make a thorough investigation of his financial situation. We make contact with the Unemployment Insurance Commission to find out if the veteran is in receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. We may with the permission of the veteran call at the bank. Then all those facts are assembled and put together.

Mr. MICHENER: In the form of a report by the person who makes the investigation?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: And what then?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: It goes to the district authority which acts on this information in accordance with the act and makes an award at the district local.

Mr. MICHENER: If an allowance is awarded, is that the end of the matter for a period of time, or is some check made?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: We carry out a re-check investigation.

Mr. MICHENER: How is that done?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: After a new applicant comes on, it is generally made one year later. Through arrangement with the chairman of the War Veterans Allowance Board, after that period we have extended the re-check investigation to approximately two years. When a veteran is 70 years of age we certainly do not investigate him every two years. We probably spread it out to three or four.

Mr. MICHENER: What is the result of the check investigation? How much does it alter the original award? In what percentage of cases does the check show some change has to be made in the original award?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I think you would have to ask the chairman of the War Veterans Allowance Board to answer that question. I have no information on the number that would be changed.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have one simple question. On the item on page 613 there is a series of veterans welfare officers, grade 4 and so on. It does not show any for this year. In the first case it is veterans welfare officer grade 2, Department of Veterans Affairs; and down below you have veterans welfare officers grade 2 appearing in a different place. What is the explanation for that?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: About three years ago the civil service commission and the department joined in a survey of positions throughout the department. Some were under classifications set up in 1943 and some were under a classification which was set up in 1946-47. As a result of the review, we now operate with a classification of one to six in the Veterans Welfare Officers group, and each employee in that group is paid according to the work he performs in the department.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now half past five. We have had to change the meeting on Friday from the morning to the afternoon. We shall meet tomorrow morning at 10:30, and again on Friday at 3:30 in this room.

The committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: **W. A. TUCKER, Esq.**

PROCEEDINGS

No. 23

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, and Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services, both of Treatment Services; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

57263—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey North*)
Brooks
Bryce
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Garland
Habel
Hanna
Hellyer
Jutras
Lapointe
MacEachen
MacLean
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Monteith
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Yuill

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, April 21, 1955.
(29)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett (*Grey North*), Brooks, Bryce, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Churchill, Dupuis, Enfield, Habel, Hellyer, Lapointe, MacLean, McLeod, Michener, Power (*St. John's West*), Tucker, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Veterans Affairs: Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, and Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services, both of Treatment Services; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Veterans Affairs Department, the Minister and his officials answering questions thereon.

Item numbered 512—Veterans' Welfare Service—was adopted.

Item numbered 513—Treatment Services—was considered.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. Friday, April 22.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

52763—1½

PROCEEDINGS

APRIL 21, 1955.
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum. If the committee will come to order we shall proceed. We are on item 512—Veterans Welfare Services. Were there any questions to which you wished to reply, Mr. Minister, or any statements you wished to make at this time?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I have here some answers to questions which were put yesterday. First of all I have the rates of pay paid to the commissionaires in the various districts. I think Mr. Churchill asked that question yesterday. I might point out before I proceed that the figures which I will give represent the total paid to the Corps of Commissionaires, and will include the administration charge of nine cents which I mentioned yesterday.

St. John's, Newfoundland 94 cents; Halifax, $1.04; St. John, New Brunswick, 94 cents; Quebec, 99 cents; Montreal, 99 cents; St. Hyacinthe, 89 cents; Ottawa, $1.03; Kingston, $1.04; Toronto, $1.09; London, $1.01; Winnipeg, 94 cents; Saskatoon, 99 cents; Calgary, $1.04; Vancouver, $1.09; and Victoria, $1.09.

Those are the rates paid to the corps as of the 1st April of this year. I might point out, that, as I mentioned yesterday, the maximum basic rate was increased effective from the 1st of April, from $1.00 to $1.15, so that during the course of the year, depending on the prevailing rate for similar work in those districts, the figures which I have given to you may be increased.

Mr. BROOKS: What determines the rates paid in the different districts? Why is there a change in respect to the rates paid, for instance, in St. John's, Newfoundland, as compared with Saint John, New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Because those rates are the prevailing rates paid in the district for similar work. It is on the same principle as the hiring of prevailing rate employees by various government departments.

The CHAIRMAN: Was there a question which you wanted to ask, Mr. Dupuis?

Mr. DUPUIS: That was the question I had in mind.

Mr. BROOKS: That charge of nine cents is an administrative charge?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. That is paid to the Corps of Commissionaires and as I was mentioning yesterday, of that nine cents, six and a half cents, I believe goes to the local division of the Corps of Commissionaires, and two and a half cents goes to headquarters, except in British Columbia where they have only one headquarters.

Mr. BROOKS: There seemed to be a little confusion yesterday about the unemployment charge.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The nine cents covers everything. It covers the liability insurance which the Corps might take out, and so on.

Mr. DUPUIS: What is the reason for paying these men by the hour instead of weekly? Is it because they do not work to set hours?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Some of them might. Others might be working part time, or their hours might be staggered.

Mr. ENFIELD: I believe university training comes under this section...

Mr. CHURCHILL: Before we leave this subject of the commissionaires—I understand those rates are set after consultation with the Corps of Commissionaires and that it is after that consultation that you get these variations as between different places across the country. The minister said that the variations were due to the fact that pay was based on comparable rates of pay for similar work. Where is the similarity between the work which the commissionaires do and that of other employees?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Watchmen hired by various industrial concerns; caretakers and others doing that sort of work, bank messengers—some of these men are hired by various banking institutions and so on.

Mr. BRYCE: It seems strange that a man in Winnipeg should get 94 cents per hour while a man in Vancouver should get $1.09 an hour. That is a difference of 15 cents an hour, and if he works a forty hour week it would amount to $6.00. There is no man in Vancouver worth $6.00 more than a man in Winnipeg.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It might cost him $6.00 more to live there.

An Hon. MEMBER: It is the other way around.

Mr. BRYCE: There is not that much difference in the cost of living.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: All I can say is that the policy is the same as that which is followed by various government departments in the hiring of prevailing rate employees. It is based on the prevailing rate for similar work in the locality.

Mr. BRYCE: I think the government should set an example and have a standard rate all over the country instead of having this rivalry. No wonder everybody wants to go to the coast if they can get 15 cents an hour more.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is indeed a debatable point, too—whether everybody wants to go to the coast.

Mr. BRYCE: There is a financial gain, anyway. It might appeal to a Scotsman.

Mr. BROOKS: What is the pay paid to stenographers in those districts? Do they receive the same pay in Vancouver as they do in St. John's, Newfoundland.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Stenographers are civil service employees—permanent staff of the civil service—and they get the rate of pay appropriate to their grade in the civil service.

Mr. CHURCHILL: These, surely, are somewhat in the same category as temporary civil servants.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. They are in the category of prevailing rate employees. They have nothing to do with the civil service.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I realize that, but from the nature of their work would it not be true to say they are somewhat in the same class as temporaries? I think the rate should be set at a standard rate right across the country. I do not see the necessity for the distinction we are making. After all this is the Department of Veterans Affairs and we are dealing with men who are veterans, otherwise they would not be in the Corps. I think the pay should be the same right across the country.

Mr. ENFIELD: Does not the Corps of Commissionaires set their rates and tell people what they are going to charge when they send men out? That is what I understand the position to be.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Are these rates requested by the corps? Has the corps asked for a uniform rate right across the country?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry. Would you mind repeating?

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Are these the rates requested by the Corps of Commissionaires?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. These are the terms agreed to. We entered into a contract with the Corps of Commissionaires and these are the rates agreed to between the department and the Corps of Commissionaires. They were submitted to the Treasury Board for approval.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Did these requests from the Corps of Commissionaires come from each district or from the corp's headquarters in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They came from the districts through their headquarters which, actually, is in Montreal and not in Ottawa.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question, Mr. Enfield?

Mr. ENFIELD: Yes. That was the point I was trying to make.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Except in British Columbia where the headquarters of the corps deals directly with us. They are independent. Their corps is independent from the rest of the corps.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): In view of Vancouver, it is too bad that all the rest of them are not independent.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The question was: Are these the rates asked for by the Corps of Commissionaires? And the minister said: These are the rates which are set as a result of consultation, which was not quite an answer to the question. Perhaps these rates are set because the department says that they shall be according to prevailing rates, and they are not set as a result of a request on the part of the corps.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, these regulations regarding rates are not set by the department itself. They are set by the Treasury Board and they apply to the employment of commissionaires throughout the government. Not only the Department of Veterans Affairs, but many other departments as well make use of the Corps of Commissionaires. The rates are arrived at, as I mentioned, in negotiation with the Corps of Commissionaires, and through the information which is provided by the Department of Labour as to prevailing rates as to that type of work in the locality where the corps is hired.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Then the negotiations start from this point: The Treasury Board in fact says it will pay at prevailing rates.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. There was a meeting this spring between the representatives of the Corps of Commissionaires, the Treasury Board, the Department of Veterans Affairs, National Defence, who employ quite a few of them, and the Department of Labour. The rates which I have mentioned as now being in existence effective the 1st of April are rates set at this conference of the representatives of the various departments and of the Corps of Commissionaires. I am told that the rates were agreed to unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: I presume that deals with the question of the commissionaires' remuneration. Do you wish to bring up a question, Mr. Enfield?

Mr. ENFIELD: I notice there is a separate item with respect to university training under 535. Perhaps I will be more in order to raise my question at that time.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Completing the things which were raised yesterday, might I have an answer to this? We were discussing the question of veterans living in the United States. I have forgotten the method of procedure which the minister said was open to veterans there in order to obtain benefits, if they were entitled to them. How do I answer a letter from a man in Massachusetts who says that he served with the Twenty Fourth Battalion, was three times wounded, is drawing no disability pension, and is an American citizen? All I want to know is this: what steps does that man take now?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall ask Mr. Melville, the Chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission, to give you the details.

Mr. J. L. MELVILLE (*Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission*): A veteran in such a situation should apply to the Canadian Pension Commission. Upon receipt of his application we would draw his service documentation and we would most likely arrange for a medical examination through the facilities of the United States Veterans Administration.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does he apply direct to Ottawa?

Mr. MELVILLE: That is right.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I have some more information here which I believe has to do with the question raised by Mr. Brooks, who wanted to know what the trend or indication was in the payment of pensions over the last few years. I have the figures of the number of pensions paid in the years starting from 1944-1945 to the present year. I could give all those figures if you wish me to, or take up some of the years.

The CHAIRMAN: We could probably put it in the record. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. BROOKS: That would be satisfactory, yes.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The information is as follows:—

NUMBER OF PENSIONS IN PAYMENT
as at 31st March, 1955

	W.W. 1, etc.	W.W. 2, etc.	NWFF, etc.	Total
1944-45.....	91,387	26,924	33	118,344
1945-46.....	89,676	53,293	33	143,002
1946-47.....	87,921	88,233	30	176,184
1947-48.....	86,224	103,963	29	190,216
1948-49.....	84,449	108,531	31	193,011
1949-50.....	83,769	112,106	32	195,907
1950-51.....	82,072	113,518	32	195,622
1951-52.....	80,235	114,160	31	194,426
1952-53.....	77,842	115,342	30	193,214
1953-54.....	75,743	116,869	30	192,642
1954-55 (28.2.55)	73,983	118,374	33	192,390

*Note: W.W. 1—World War 1
W.W. 2—World War 2
NWFF—North West Field Force

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: 1944-55 shows 118,344 pensions in payment, for instance. 1949-50 shows 195, 907 pensions in payment. And this year, as of the 28th of February the figures are 192,390 pensions in payments.

Mr. BROOKS: It reached its peak in what year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The peak would have been reached in 1949-50, in the figure which I just gave you.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am sorry I have to refer to the salaries paid to the Corps of Commissionaires. How are they fixed at a rate of 90 cents for Montreal compared to $1.09 paid in Toronto, when it is well-known that in Montreal the cost of living is higher than anywhere else in the country.

Mr. BRYCE: That is what I asked.

Mr. DUPUIS: We all know that the cost of living in Montreal is the highest of all over the country, yet we are paid at the lowest rate. Is there any reason for that?

Mr. BRYCE: Have you got the cost of living rates there?

Mr. DUPUIS: No, but it is well established; it is to be found in all the books and papers.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As I mentioned, the rates are not fixed on the index of consumer prices or on the cost of living. They are fixed upon prevailing rates for similar employment. I do not know what the rates are in various trades in Montreal as compared to Toronto, or whether a carpenter gets more per hour in Montreal than he would get in Toronto; but that is the principle which is followed.

Mr. DUPUIS: I would like to be informed at the next meeting why the rates are so low in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I think you would find, if you looked through the cost of living and consumer price index, that it is not higher in Montreal than it is in Toronto. In fact, it is not higher in either of those places as compared with some other places in Canada. The deputy minister points out that one advantage to that is that these rates are adopted according to fluctuations in the prevailing rates in the district. They are looked at regularly; and if the prevailing rates in a district for similar work increase, then a new agreement is entered into with the Corps of Commissionaires in that particular locality.

The CHAIRMAN: When it was decided to set up this body to try to provide as much work as possible in this way for ex-servicemen, it was hoped that not only would the government employ them, but they would also be employed by private industry and similar organizations; and the Corps of Commissionaires, I believe, wants to extend their ability to provide this work as widely as possible. Naturally they do not want to get their rates out of line with prevailing rates in the district, otherwise they would not be able to provide as much work for the members of their corps as they otherwise would. The control is by the Corps of Commissionaires organization itself and the purpose is to get as many of their people placed in work as possible. I think that is why you will find that they have agreed to these varying rates in order to get as many of their people placed as possible. I can easily see why they would not ask the government to pay more than they could get from private industry because that would lead to difficulties as between the various people that have to be placed in various jobs. In other words, the corps itself places people in various jobs, as I understand it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, would not the prestige of the Corps of Commissionaires enable the government to take the lead in raising wages in the various localities? Of course, now the Corps of Commissionaires has established that prestige so it would be quite difficult for these people or other groups to undercut them for that kind of work.

The CHAIRMAN: I think they would be just as anxious as anybody, to do the best they could for their people, and if they get the government rate up much higher in one place than in another then the difficulty would be that there would be a tendency for them to say that the government is paying this and so you have to pay it, and then possible employers would say we will get our watchmen from some place else. I am sure the people running the Corps of Commissionaire are trying to run it to the best advantage of the people they are working for. I remember when the organization was set up several years ago, and I think it has worked out very well indeed.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I think that is quite true, Mr. Chairman. I suppose the government is the biggest user of the corps, but industry and private enterprise have started making use of it. However, these people of the Corps of Commissionaires have to do a tremendous selling job in spite of the high prestige of the corps. I think every employer who has hired the services of the corps have found it very satisfactory and becomes a very good propagandist, but they still have to do a selling job in order to get some of the industries

and private enterprises to make use of the corps. In many cases some of these people prefer giving that type of work to some of their older employees who would possibly have reached retiring age in their own particular trade and are retired, but are made use of by being taken on part-time in guard duty and that type of work. That is one of the difficulties the corps meets.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): That certainly would be so, and I for one would not care to see the Corps of Commissionaires deprive old employees of that type of work, and no matter how low you reduced the pay of the Corps of Commissionaires you would not replace those people.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We do not reduce it, we keep it at the level which is paid in the locality.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I think that the people who are now calling on the Corps of Commissionaires for employees for that type of work should by now have been conditioned to the point, when they have no employees of their own of that type whom they consider trustworthy, they would be prepared to go to the Corps of Commissionaires even though the rate was a bit higher than that paid to watchmen in the area and I think the government has the responsibility to try and raise those rates.

Mr. BRYCE: But could you give any explanation of why in Vancouver, where they get the highest rate, that you have the lower grades; what is the reason for that?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that this is purely an administrative arrangement. They are submitted to exactly the same regulations as in the rest of the country, and this is purely an internal and administrative policy within the corps itself. We have nothing to do with it. They have the same rate in Toronto which is fixed through the headquarters.

Mr. BRYCE: How is it that Winnipeg which is sandwiched in between the two of them has a rate that is 15 cents an hour less?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The prevailing rate for that type of work is lower. Why is a carpenter, a plumber or a painter paid more in Vancouver than in Winnipeg?

Mr. BRYCE: He is not paid more.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh yes.

Mr. BRYCE: But the cost of living is not as high.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Byrne?

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, I think if we are going to discuss this whole question of wages we will be getting into quite a long study, but my opinion is that when the salaries are paid on the prevailing rate basis, that they are more equitable. In Vancouver, for instance, the rates paid are higher and necessarily the cost of living is higher. The stores pay their employees higher rates, and I am quite sure that you will find the cost of living is higher in Vancouver. If a typist or clerk in Newfoundland, for instance, were getting the same rates as a typist in the Civil Service Commission—I believe they enjoy a higher standard of living than the typist in Vancouver.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): You have never been in St. John's!

Mr. BYRNE: No, I have never been in St. John's, I have been in the maritime provinces and I find quite a difference in the cost of living in the two areas.

Mr. BROOKS: Will you explain this as you go along. They tell us in Vancouver and Victoria they have summer nearly all the year round, and down in the maritimes we have to burn fuel six or seven months of the year. Just how can the cost of living be lower; in Victoria, for instance—

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Brooks, that is what they told you!

Mr. BYRNE: And apart from that, the general wage scales are higher in Vancouver, and for that reason—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BYRNE: —the cost of living is higher.

Mr. ENFIELD: They say an ordinary umbrella only lasts about one good rain.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Bryce asks why the Corps of Commissionaires get 15 cents less an hour in Winnipeg than in Vancouver. What about the pensioners? They get $15 more in Vancouver than in Winnipeg, and I believe in Saskatchewan the same thing applies. Up until this year I think the old age pensioners were paid $12.50 less in Regina than in Vancouver or Victoria. I think they are paying more to pensioners in British Columbia because they feel it is necessary, but I do not see how we are going to ever get through this if we are going to quarrel.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is a difference in the amount of money paid as between Manitoba and British Columbia. Would that not be due to the cost of living? It certainly has nothing to do with the federal government?

Mr. BYRNE: No, certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me, gentlemen, we have gone into this thoroughly enough. The Corps of Commissionaires is doing the best it can for its own people and they probably know more about what is to the advantage of their people than a member of parliament who is taking a cursory look at it.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Would you tell us this, Mr. Chairman? Was there a negotiation between the Corps of Commissionaires and the government on the rate they were going to pay them?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it has already been said that there was a conference this spring that ended in February.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does that not imply that the Corps of Commissionaires got out of the government all they could get out of it?

The CHAIRMAN: I think it implies they got out of the government what they thought it would be wise for them to ask for.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The implication that the Corps of Commissionaires has set this rate is quite erroneous. The government has set the rate.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I did not say that. I said the rate was the result of negotiation, like all prevailing rates are. It is a normal process.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): The Chairman was suggesting that the Corps of Commissionaires knew better about this and that the implication was they had decided this was the right wage rate.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you will find if you get in touch with them they would be concerned not only with getting the rates as high as possible but with getting them at a level where they can get as many people employed as possible. I remember when this was set up it was quite a new idea and I think that this department had quite a bit to do with setting it up. I think everybody is pleased that it has gone as well as it has.

Mr. MCLEOD: We are wasting time on this and this committee has apparently developed into some kind of a labour board. I would suggest that those critics go to the headquarters of the Corps of Commissionaires and put their problems up to them and have them, if they see fit to do so, request the government to increase the wages and then, if the departments of government refuse that request then we would have a legitimate request. Until this is done I think all this is just a waste of time.

The CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we could pass on now to another subject.

Mr. MACLEAN: I asked a quetion yesterday about the classification of various employees of the department here. I referred specifically to veterans welfare officers. I would like to ask a supplementary question in that respect or enlarge on the question I asked. I notice on page 613 it gives the numbers of employees in various categories and that this year the setup is quite different than it was last year all the way down the page. Just for instance, a little more than half-way down on the page last year there were 10 occupational counsellors and I do not see any listed for this year. I suppose that is a reclassification of employment. Would the minister be kind enough to give a complete explanation of why this change has come about and whether it was initiated by the Department of Veterans Affairs or whether it is a result of new regulations by the Civil Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I think that Mr. Parliament yesterday gave some explanation concerning this particular point. Mr. Parliament, would you like to enlarge on that with reference particulary to the occupationa counsellors to which Mr. MacLean just referred.

Mr. MACLEAN: And there are a number of grade changes. For instance, review clerks; there were two last year and 29 this year. And in the other trades where there were a large number last year there are none this year and vice versa.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: When the Civil Service Commission, treasury and the officials of the department first consideerd this question we had a number of classifications which had become obsolete such as occupational counsellors. It was decided to set up six different classifications of welfare officer and to reassign these people to those positions whereby people paid the same money would be doing exactly the same work, this included investigators, occupational counsellors, the old veterans officers grade 2, the assistant welfare officers, and others—almost all positions shown at the top of the page—were absorbed in the figures shown below. With the review clerks you will also notice that clerk grade 4 positions are reduced from 72 to 26. They have become review clerks at the same salary and their responsibility is to review the material set before the War Veterans Allowance Board for adjudication. They are the same people in another classification.

Mr. BROOKS: In this case you call them veterans welfare officers, Department of Veterans Affairs in 1954 and just veterans welfare officers in 1955.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: This was the old civil service classification for welfare officers but there was no relationship between the salaries of the veterans welfare officer grade 3, Department of Veterans Affairs, and grade 3 veterans welfare officer, as now set up.

Mr. BROOKS: There is no wholesale upgrading by the civil service?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: No. But some men by reclassification have received considerably more money.

Mr. BROOKS: Were they entitled to it?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: They were doing exactly the same work but salaries varied as much as $1,000 for a man doing exactly the same work and this was to clear up that situation.

Mr. BROOKS: They were brought up and levelled off?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Many of them were brought up.

Mr. MACLEAN: But the general position was to eliminate any difference in the rate of pay for the work done.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: The principle was equal pay for equal work.

Mr. BROOKS: Is there a board set up which goes through the different departments to look after this particular grading of civil servants? For

instance, a board who determines whether there should be an upgrade, a downgrade, or wholesale change such as there was in this department?

Mr. LALONDE: The answer to that, Colonel Brooks, is that in this instance the work changed between 1946, 1947 and 1948, which were the immediate years after the war, and 1952. The occupational counsellers in 1946 and 1947 had to deal with a lot of veterans being discharged. Later on they assumed other responsibilities and the department wanted to readjust their status on the basis of equal pay for equal work. We asked the Civil Service Commission to conduct a unit survey of all welfare services in the department in conjunction with our representatives. Both the Civil Service Commission and the department went around all the district offices to determine the proper classifications for the work and to equalize the responsibilities of the employees. This survey team reported to the department and the commission. Their findings were analyzed and an establishment on the basis of the new classifications was agreed upon. Following that, there was a board set up in each district to assess the individual capabilities to fill the new classifications and the recommendations of each board were submitted to a board at headquarters and that board gave the final approval to the whole plan.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the composition of the boards in the district?

Mr. LALONDE: There was the district administrator, the assistant district administrator where we have one, and the superintendent of welfare services.

Mr. BROOKS: The Civil Service Commission did not enter into it at all.

Mr. LALONDE: Not in the rating of departmental officers based upon individual performance.

Mr. BROOKS: I notice in 1954 and 1955, for instance, there were 89 welfare officers grade 1 and when you come to 1955 and 1956 there were only 40 grade 1 and in 1954-55 there were 10 welfare officers grade 3 and 149 for this year. That means a big difference in the amount.

Mr. LALONDE: No, because a lot of people who were called investigators, and who were part of the welfare service before this change, have become welfare officers. The welfare officers, grades 1 and 2, as Mr. Parliament said yesterday, do carry out this work of investigation now, although they are called welfare officers. We like that title a lot better because they not only investigate specific things, but if they find welfare problems it is their job to recommend ways and means of dealing with them.

The CHAIRMAN: The proof, Mr. Brooks, that there has not been any wholesale change of salaries is found in the total amount entered for salaries—in 1954-55, $2,942,000, and this year $2,926,000. It is quite true that there has been a decrease in the number of employees in this branch by 27 but the actual change in the amount asked for in the estimate is a difference of approximately $16,000—a reduction—so that would indicate there is not much change.

Mr. BROOKS: It looks to be more of a change, perhaps, than it is.

Mr. LALONDE: There has been a complete reorganization of that branch to meet conditions which have levelled off now.

The CHAIRMAN: Was there any other question on this?

Mr. BROOKS: We know that after the war there were a great many more civil servants needed in this department than are, perhaps, needed now. Who determines what civil servants should be gotten rid of in a department and who should remain?

Mr. LALONDE: In each district there is what we call a separation board composed of the district administrator, the personnel officer and the head of the branch concerned. If the board is dealing with welfare services, it would be the superintendent of welfare; if it were dealing with treatment services,

it would be the senior treatment medical officer, and so on. These are the people who analyze the work and capabilities of each of the employees. If we have six employees in one group, and the work has diminished to the point where only four are needed, this board recommends to Head Office that the four best employees be retained and the two who are not quite as good should be separated.

Mr. BROOKS: What would happen to them if they were permanent civil servants?

Mr. LALONDE: If they were permanent civil servants and their work was good enough for them to be retained, in most cases we would be able to fit them into other posts. We have had to let some go, but very few.

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the percentage or the amount of what we might call the "wastage" of employees of the department? I am referring to people who have to give up their jobs for health reasons, people who have proved unsatisfactory and who have to be relieved of their jobs or dispensed with as unsuitable for one reason or another.

Mr. LALONDE: There is a greater turn-over in the staff working in the hospitals in the category of cleaners, helpers or hospital maids. They come and work for six months; some of them don't like it, so they just go away.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was not thinking of the casual employees or the lower grades of staff.

Mr. LALONDE: In the administration itself the wastage per year, I would say, is less than one half of one per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: You had another question to answer, Mr. Minister, did you not?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. I think Mr. Churchill was asking yesterday about the departmental activities in the Northwest Territories. According to our figures based on the 1951 census, there would be 2884 veterans in the Yukon, Mackenzie, Keewatin and Franklin districts. In the Yukon the figure is 1786. The Yukon comes under Vancouver for administartion. In the district of Mackenzie there would be 945. The district of Mackenzie comes under Edmonton for administration. In the Keewatin district there would be 57, and that district comes under Winnipeg for administration. In the district of Franklin there are 96, and they come directly under Ottawa. We service these people. In the Yukon, in Dawson, there is permanently stationed in the U.I.C. office a veterans' officer who handles as far as he can the problems of that region. From the various head offices in Vancouver, Edmonton and Winnipeg are sent regularly welfare officers and they travel about. Furthermore, our Veterans Land Act people who have business in that area and who travel around handle welfare problems—actually, all problems—in the same manner as our welfare officers do when they go into the region.

In the district of Franklin, of course, it is a little more difficult, and there we make use mostly of the R.C.M.P. and of service personnel who may be stationed in that area. In addition we send people on that boat which makes a yearly trip round that district.

Mr. MACLEAN: What district does the Magdalen islands come under?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It comes under Charlottetown, but for treatment services those veterans who are French-speaking and who wish to be hospitalized in the hospital in Quebec can be hospitalized there, and the same thing applies to the examination of their cases for pension. Actually, the pension officer from Quebec is the one who deals with Magdalen island cases, and he goes there regularly every year.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Mr. MICHENER: I have a question or two to ask. I wonder, too, whether I might have an answer to the question I asked yesterday with regard to the number of recipients of welfare allowances in the Toronto district.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The total as of February 28 this year was 7,073. I can break that down if you wish.

Mr. MICHENER: I would like to know how many are first world war veterans and how many are veterans of the second world war.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I can tell you how many are veterans, how many are dependents, and how many are widows.

There are 4,478 veterans; 142 dependents; 2,439 widows, and 14 orphans. I am sorry I have not got the breakdown as betwen the two world wars. However, we can give you, roughly, the proportion.

Mr. MICHENER: Would that proportion of widows to veterans in receipt of the allowance apply throughout the whole country?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The proportion in Vancouver is higher, as far as I can recall. We have a little over 10,000 widows throughout the country drawing war veterans' allowance out of a total of 40,000-odd recipients.

Mr. MICHENER: There are 44,916 receiving war veterans' allowance throughout the whole country.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the total here. There are 11,671 widows throughout the country receiving war veterans' allowance out of a total, on the date I have just mentioned, of 45,051.

Mr. MICHENER: Can you give me the proportion of veterans receiving war veterans' allowance throughout the country who are World War I veterans?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Out of the total of Canadian veterans receiving war veterans' allowances there are 25,766 from World War I and 2,568 from World War II.

Mr. MICHENER: That is a little more than ten to one. I notice that in the vote which we shall come to later $26 millions are provided for war veterans' allowances in respect of World War I and $2,750,000 in respect of World War II. That, also, is about ten to one.

I want to pursue now the question of the need for investigation, particularly in respect to World War I veterans. I suppose that most of the recipients of allowances would be between 55 and 60 years of age.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Most of them would be over 60.

Mr. MICHENER: And after establishing their original entitlement, the allowance would go on automatically if it were not for new factors. What new factors could arise which would change the allowance?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Steady employment; increased income above the ceiling set.

Mr. MICHENER: Those are the only things which would alter it?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Those are the only things which would alter it.

Mr. MICHENER: That, or death.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: And that is final.

Mr. MICHENER: But a change in income or employment status —

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: — would be the main factors.

Mr. MICHENER: That would be the real subject of investigation.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There might be investigations continuing although a man was receiving his allowance regularly for welfare purposes. These recipients are looked after, I might say, by welfare services also and in cases where these people are old or sick we always have somebody to keep in touch with them.

Mr. MICHENER: What welfare services are there in addition to the provisions for actual illness—treatment, I take it, is separate from welfare?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as the estimates are concerned.

Mr. MICHENER: What other benefits are there besides benefits in respect of illness which are administered by these welfare services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There might be in some cases the assistance fund.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that an emergency amount for a particular purpose?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. It goes to the recipient of a war veterans allowance if it can be established that his needs are such that the amount of the allowance is insufficient and he has no other source of income. The amount he receives is increased from the assistance fund up to the level of the ceiling. That calls for investigation.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes. That is an additional amount beyond the normal payment. But is there anything else which comes under the heading of welfare which is administered by this staff?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Perhaps I could answer that question in this way. Take the province of Ontario, Mr. Michener. There is still $600,000 left in the canteen fund from World War I. There is the soldiers aid commission which also provides funds. It is not often these men get into difficulties, but if they do get into difficulties with their families, many forms of assistance are available in all of the different provinces. In addition there is a disabled persons allowance which has proved a boon to a great many of these veterans who have disabled children. I might add that veterans do run into difficulties in connection with accommodation and if we are able to assist them with regard to this we do so in addition to looking after their general welfare.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it service they need most, or money?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Service, I think. Except that in Ontario there is quite a bit of assistance granted through the canteen fund, the soldiers aid commission and the three benevolent funds.

Mr. MICHENER: I appreciate that these other services, which are parallel, are in existence. But I am thinking of the actual services given through the staff with which we are dealing in this vote—the staff of 825 people—and I was wondering how much of the time of these people is engaged in the handling of the allowances themselves and how much in supplementary or additional services such as Mr. Parliament has just mentioned.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: When a welfare officer goes into the field he covers all of the welfare problems which may arise, in addition to the administration of the war veterans allowance. It so happened that I was reviewing yesterday morning some reports from the districts and I have with me a welfare officer's report for the 24th of March, and this is what he did on that particular day, when away from the district office. Perhaps if I summarized it that might help to answer the question.

He saw seven recipients of war veterans allowances and completed investigations. He saw one veteran who had a welfare problem and one who had an administrative problem; he considered three applicants for army benevolent fund, and he made contact with three veterans officers in the UIC in connection with veterans problems. One of the things which a veterans welfare officer can frequently do is to get some of these men permanent employment through the UIC. We work very closely with the UIC and when, particularly, a World War I veteran is out of work for twenty-eight days or more we sit down with the UIC, a representative of the Legion and a welfare officer, and see if we can find out some reason why the veteran should be unemployed. In some cases there is a pension problem, and this is referred to the pension commission. In other cases, maybe, we can find

suitable employment for the veteran and I know that has been an important part of our work. In other cases, if no other help is available, we suggest that the veteran would probably qualify for war veteran's allowance. These are services which are given by the men in the field.

Mr. MICHENER: I appreciate the value of that. In the instance you have just referred to, you said the welfare officer saw seven veterans allowance cases. I suppose that was the major part of the work that day.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: That was just one day.

Mr. MICHENER: As I think was stated in an earlier answer, the purpose of the investigation is to see whether the veteran has entered into some permanent employment or is in receipt of some income since his allowance was awarded, because such a change might disentitle him to the allowance and would constitute altered circumstances. If that is so, I wonder whether any information could be given as to the result of these investigations. Do they in fact change the amount of the awards very much, looking at the whole picture?

Mr. LALONDE: They do not change the amount of the award in most cases, but we have found over the last two or three years that periodical checks are very important in the case of recipients who have not reached the age of seventy, because in many cases they prevent the building up of large overpayments which are always a source of great difficulty if they are not caught right at the beginning. During the years 1950-52 there was a reorganization in the department in connection with the handling of the war veterans allowance, and there was a period when the number of rechecks was kept at an absolute minimum.

As a result there are many cases which come before me now for recovery of overpayments in the thousands of dollars; and that creates an insoluble problem for those veterans. We are trying now to prevent the building up of such large overpayments.

Mr. MICHENER: You are trying to find them when the overpayment begins.

Mr. LALONDE: Right at the beginning, if we can; and I think it is a good service to the veteran himself.

Mr. MICHENER: I was wondering what the extent of it was, and whether it justifies the cost of investigation of every veteran that is involved in this investigational service. I think the answer would depend to a large extent on how much the veteran is getting in excess of what he is entitled to receive, and how many cases there are of veterans who are getting away with something.

Mr. LALONDE: I would say that actual overpayments probably do not occur in more than 10 per cent of cases, but the difficulty is in finding out which of those are the ten per cent cases involved. On an overall basis, the work of the welfare officers in connection with the war veterans allowance —and that includes the original application, the rechecks, and the assistance fund, investigation—is between 25 and 33 per cent of the work of the welfare branch.

Mr. MICHENER: The purpose of my question is to see whether this investigation is really worth what it costs, because the amount of this vote is about $3 million, which is about ten per cent of the total allowance paid. If the cost is largely due to investigation, then I would suggest to the minister that there might be a case for considering the abandonment of the investigations, if they are not saving more than they cost. That is really the point I am driving at in asking this question about the method of investigation and the extent of it and the result. In other words, if you gave the veteran the

benefit of the doubt and left a few of them to get away with perhaps something they were not entitled to, whether it would not be cheaper in the long run.

Mr. LALONDE: We would eventually catch up with them. It is impossible to do otherwise. Then the burden would be on the veteran and upon his estate, if he had an estate.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): Sometimes these investigations work out to the benefit of the veteran.

Mr. LALONDE: Definitely. That is one of the aspects of the investigation.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): Quite often they may find that the veteran could qualify for the assistance fund, or for treatment.

Mr. LALONDE: That is right. Many veterans do not know that they have certain rights. We do not like the word investigation. That is why we got away from the title of investigators. It is not an inquisition. It is a visit by a departmental representative who sits down with the veteran and says: "How are things going? What problems have you got?"

Mr. MICHENER: Let us take a veteran who obviously is not capable of doing a hard day's work and is receiving the allowance. It seems to me that the cost of investigating him in order to find that he does not make more than a certain number of dollars which he is permitted to earn in a year when probably there is a prima facie inference that he would not make more than the allowable amount of money,—that the cost of investigating a case of that kind might be more than the loss, if there was no investigation.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: In the case of a recipient over 70, where we have known over a period of years what his situation is, this investigation would not take place very often. We know, for instance, that the old veteran and his wife may be residing in a little house in a rural district. We know that he does not work. He is sick and she is sick. We know their condition. The only visit may be that of a welfare officer, and it would be made for welfare purposes only.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that the real answer is that this vote comprises a lot of services in the way of welfare services and is not limited to investigational activity.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact you will find that these welfare officers, and to the same degree, similarily the Veterans Land Act settlement officers, are well informed on all aspects of veteran legislation; and in the course of their visits and their duty they fulfill practically every job possible.

Mr. MICHENER: I appreciate the time you have given me on this subject. I understand that the investigating officers are not too zealous to find that the man has been making a little extra money. When there is overpayment I understand that the arrangements for repayment are so kindly that I only wish I could meet my creditors in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN: Might I point out, for example, that in the 1953-54 fiscal year the number of cases approved in that year for reinstatement were 11,455.

Mr. MICHENER: Perhaps the figures of the possible number of cases where repayment is being requested from the veteran, might be given. How many overpayment cases are there on the books of the department?

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): I have never had a complaint about the work of a welfare officer. I think that the public finds them to be extremely good.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I have some figures which might give you some idea of the activity of that particular work. In the last three months of 1954 there was a total of 3,597 investigations made pertaining to war veterans allowance. The result of that is that in 1,005 cases the allowance was

increased; in 980 cases the allowance was decreased; in 1,301 cases it was discontinued; and in 311 cases it was reinstated. In the case of the 980 which were decreased, and the 1,301 cases where the allowance was discontinued, everyone of those two thousand odd cases would have been potential overpayments.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: Are there a large number of cases? I do not expect that there are. But I would be interested to have an estimate of the number of cases of overpayment of war veterans allowance of which the department does not become aware until after the recipient dies, and legal action has to be taken against his estate in order to recover.

Mr. LALONDE: There are very few cases where they have an estate which will enable us to recover. We do not recover from the widow's allowance.

Mr. MACLEAN: I realize that.

Mr. BRYCE: But you recover from his estate?

Mr. LALONDE: If he has one; but there are very few cases where that situation occurs.

Mr. MACLEAN: There are cases where they do, however.

Mr. LALONDE: There have been some but I do not know how many.

Mr. BROOKS: In connection with the investigation there is a limit to the amount of money which a man can have in order to get the war veterans allowance. Do these investigators investigate a man's bank account, and his financial standing before they make a report? Supposing a man owned a property—and he is allowed $6,000, for a home. Then how much money would he be allowed to have in the bank?

Mr. LALONDE: If he is married, he has an exemption of $2,000; and if he is single, it is $1,000. They investigate the income and assets of the recipient.

Mr. BRYCE: But if he had a $6,000 home, and was in receipt of a war veterans allowance, upon overpayment the department would collect from that $6,000?

Mr. LALONDE: No.

Mr. BRYCE: I am asking for information. I do not know whether it is right or not.

Mr. LALONDE: The $6,000 home in which he resides would be exempt for the purpose of war veterans allowance. But if the man died and left a home valued at $6,000, then the department would have the right to proceed through the Department of Justice to recover the overpayment from those assets.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): We would not put this widow out of the house.

The CHAIRMAN: You could not.

Mr. LALONDE: We are as lenient as the Act allows us to be.

Mr. BROOKS: Would they also check up on the casual earnings? Is it part of the welfare officer's duty to check up on the work which a man is doing, or is going to claim as casual earnings?

Mr. LALONDE: He does, and I think it is a good thing, because when he makes his report, he says that the man is acting as a caretaker and is earning $45 a month. That goes on his file but nothing else happens because it is casual earnings.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: He is not the one who decides whether it is casual earnings or not. He merely reports it to the district authority, and the district authority pass judgment on the matter.

Mr. BROOKS: If it is not casual earnings, then they say it is over paid?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That might be the case.

Mr. LALONDE: Or, in some cases, a man might say: "Am I entitled to take a job as caretaker at $30 a month?" And the welfare officer says, "Certainly, this will not affect your allowance. This is casual earnings."

Mr. BROOKS: Under casual earnings there would not be as much overpayment as there has been in the past.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

Mr. YUILL: What is the amount of casual earnings which is allowed before it will interfere with the pension?

The CHAIRMAN: That matter was gone into in veterans affairs committee. You have the right to ask for it here, but the question is whether we should take the time to go into it again because it has already been gone into at this Session.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will give you the directives.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): It is to be found in an Appendix to minutes number 3 of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is in an appendix to Minutes No. 3 of the veterans affairs committee of this year. You will find all those figures are given.

Mr. YUILL: Thank you very much.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was wondering what liaison there was between the veterans welfare services and the various services and benevolent funds. I know this is not directly the responsibility of the department—but it seems to me that a lot of veterans who have no entitlement to benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs but might be entitled to a loan or a grant from one or other of the veterans funds, feel rightly or wrongly, that their cases are not pressed forward with the same vigor as the case of a man serving in the service. I know that is not directly the responsibility of this department, but I was wondering just what liaison there was between the veterans welfare services and the various civilian representatives of the three benevolent funds.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps Mr. Parliament would give you that information.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: The navy and the air force funds, as you know, are incorporated on their own. We carry out the factual investigation for the three service funds and then pass the investigation on to the service funds. They make the decision. I feel the liaison at head office with the main committees is as close as it would be possible to have it, and that sometimes we can assist in obtaining a favourable decision. But we must remember that these funds are responsible for their own policy and their own decisions. However we feel that we are doing all that we possibly can to put the case up in such a way that if it is a deserving case, a favourable decision would be rendered.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is one point I am not clear on in Mr. Parliament's remarks. In employing a welfare officer in your department, might he not say to an applicant: "While you are not qualified to receive benefits from the Department, nevertheless you might qualify to receive benefits from the air force benevolent fund"? And might he not make out the application and forward it directly to the Air Force Benevolent Fund headquarters here in Ottawa, or is the man merely referred to the local civilian representative of the benefit fund?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I think that most of the welfare officers complete the application and the investigation and turn it over to the provincial committee who are, in the first instance, responsible for the decision.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Going on to another topic, I notice that there is a vote of $25,000 for correspondence courses, and in the annual report at page 15 there is a list of people who benefit from those correspondence courses. How has the department come to be involved with so many non-veterans for that purpose? Some are in the civil service, some are in the penitentiaries, and some are apparently in hospitals. What is the explanation for that?

Mr. LALONDE: Mr. Churchill, the interest of the department in these correspondence courses started in 1946 when the department took over the Canadian Legion Educational Services. At that time the bulk of those who followed those courses were veterans. Subsequently the number of veterans interested in those courses diminished because they were re-established and working and did not need to continue those courses except to supplement their education. We still had the set-up to operate these courses; we still had most of the text books, and there were still some veterans who were interested in the courses. So it was decided to continue the correspondence courses because it would have been rather difficult to stop completely giving that service to the veterans, even though their number was much smaller. There was an agreement with other departments of government, such as penitentiaries, to use our facilities for the purpose which they felt they needed. The armed services also asked us to help them in supplying correspondence courses to serving members. The cost of this vote, $25,000, is mostly for examiners' fees. When a student has completed his course, he has to get a diploma; otherwise the course is useless to him. We have an understanding with universities and schools whereby they will examine those papers. $19,000 of this $25,000 is for the purpose of examining fees and these are remitted by the various organizations using those courses. But when there is a refund it goes into consolidated revenue and therefore we do not get credit for it. Actually, it does not cost the government $25,000. The government gets a refund through consolidated revenue.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Department of Justice, for the penitentiaries, and the Department of National Defence do not reimburse you?

Mr. LALONDE: They reimburse consolidated revenue.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: In the case of the Department of Justice they pay $4 per course. In the case of serving personnel, it is given free as it was to veterans. But National Defence has set up a fund of $50,000 which pays for the reprinting of text books as it might become necessary for their personnel.

Mr. MICHENER: May I ask about the stationery item? I notice that there is an increase of $10,000 although there is an actual decrease in the staff this year. What is the explanation for the 33⅓ per cent rise in stationery—more paper work?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Answering M.P.'s inquiries!

The CHAIRMAN: What page are you looking at?

Mr. MICHENER: Page 614.

Mr. LALONDE: The reason for the increase, Mr. Michener, is that there are what we call "common users" items, letterheads and stationery and some forms which are being used by all units of the department, and through our financial adviser we have this year effected a new pro rating of these items, so that the increase to this vote is offset by a decrease in another vote under the same heading of office stationery and supplies. Welfare services, according to the accounting figures, were not carrying the load of all the office stationery, supplies and equipment which should have been charged to them. It is strictly a new method of accounting.

Mr. MICHENER: Perhaps you would give me the total then for the whole department?

Mr. MACE: Yes. The total provision for 1955-56 is $255,200 and the estimated expenditure for 1954-55, I do not have the actual figures as the current fiscal year has only just finished, is $250,300. There is a slight increase in there, and I think you will find that it can be accounted for just by the normal increase in prices,—and

Mr. MICHENER: What was the budgeted amount last year?

Mr. MACE: —in particular the cost of the microfilming program at head office.

Mr. LALONDE: That is a new item because we are now starting to microfilm files to save space, and also in order to secure duplicate documents in case of loss by fire or otherwise. In the war service records department, there is only one set of each man's war service documents. We are now microfilming these in order that we will have a duplicate set in the event of fire.

Mr. MICHENER: You gave me the estimated expenditure for last year.

Mr. MACE: Yes, I am sorry I do not have the actual provision figures, but I would suggest that the more appropriate figure used in a comparison for next year is the actual expenditure. We had to get a further supplementary estimate for this Item in Departmental Administration because we ran into a few additional equipment purchases.

The CHAIRMAN: On page 610 you will notice the estimated actual expenditure at the bottom of the page was $2,225,000 for the fiscal year just ended, and you will notice that the estimates provided for $2,214,000, so there is actually an over-expenditure there of $11,000 which is pretty close estimating.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On this item for office stationery, supplies and equipment, you show an increase on page 610 of $11,000, the one Mr. Michener just mentioned of $9,500, and a corresponding decrease in various other sections of the department ranging from $250 up to $6,000. For instance, the pension commission is down by $6,000. That is what you mean by balancing it out, but the overall total has not changed much?

Mr. LALONDE: That is right.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Some of the departments were spending more than they were required to spend?

Mr. LALONDE: Some of them were over-charged, and some were under-charged in the accounting process.

Mr. MACLEAN: The same explanation, I suppose, applies to the change in the amount of postage in this branch?

The CHAIRMAN: You are referring to page —?

Mr. MACLEAN: 614.

Mr. MACE: New rates for postage became effective on the first of April last year, but it was not provided for initially in the 1954-55 estimates, because they were prepared before the rates came into effect, so the 1954-55 provision is lower than the actual expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN: You had a question, Mr. Enfield, which we did not take. Do you want to ask it at this point or on item 535?

Mr. ENFIELD: On item 535.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I hope this will be my last question on this particular vote. The veterans welfare service administration, the Act dealing with the children of the war dead which is mentioned in the annual report on page 15—where does the vote occur for that particular item?

Mr. MACE: Under the Rehabilitation Benefits, sir, and particularly under University Training.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It is included in that?

Mr. MACE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be item 535. Will this carry now?

Mr. MACLEAN: One small question. This item for the training of blinded pensioners and payments to the Canadian Institute for the Blind—about how many veterans are receiving training of that type?

Mr. MACE: No veterans are receiving training now; maybe one or two. But this is mostly for "after care" service, and I think it is being supplied to 329 veterans.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. BROOKS: I just wanted to ask Mr. Parliament one question. He mentioned yesterday that the branch was very much concerned with the rehabilitation of disabled and older veterans. What is the situation now regarding older veterans, and what steps are the department now taking to look after the older veterans in connection with providing veterans homes and that sort of thing for their care?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I believe that question will have to be answered by the deputy minister.

Mr. BROOKS: The question had to do with veterans homes and the care of older veterans. Mr. Parliament mentioned yesterday that one of the great concerns of the branch was the rehabilitation of the disabled and older veterans, and I was wondering what we were doing in that connection as compared, for instance, with what is being done in Australia and Great Britain, where they are establishing homes for the older veterans?

Mr. LALONDE: I believe that the same subject came up before, Mr. Brooks, in the veterans affairs committee.

Mr. BROOKS: But we did not receive a very good answer to it.

Mr. LALONDE: As you know, at the moment we have a number of older veterans under domiciliary care, and we do have in all districts, I think, across Canada—homes for this purpose. I gather that your question is, should we have more of them or should we dispense with domiciliary care?

Mr. BROOKS: There are a great many older veterans particularly throughout the country districts who are having a very lonesome time of it and my understanding is that in Great Britain and Australia they are providing homes for the older veterans and are bringing them in for general care and in order to look after them.

Mr. LALONDE: On the same basis as domiciliary care?

Mr. BROOKS: Yes.

Mr. LALONDE: I do not know exactly what their system is, but I know that we do not have 100 per cent occupancy in all our veterans homes and that it fluctuates a great deal. What we find, and I think the director general of treatment services will bear me out on this, is that 50 per cent of those veterans require active treatment at all times. That active treatment is not as easy to administer in the veterans homes as in the hospitals, and there is a constant movement between the veterans homes and the hospital. We are coming more and more to the conclusion that the bulk of these veterans should be hospitalized in active treatment hospitals or near active treatment hospitals. We do not believe that homes for the aged, such as you may have in mind, are the best solution to the problem, because of the percentage of veterans who require active treatment at all times.

Mr. BROOKS: Could you not give them active treatment in the homes if there were doctors and nurses connected with the homes?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The homes we have now are serviced by medical personnel, and they have nurses, but the experience has been that in many

cases they do need active treatment and they are more efficiently dealt with and better cared for by being hospitalized in one of our hospitals rather than being kept in one of the homes. We have homes in Halifax, in St. John, Senneville which is near Ste. Anne de Bellevue, in Montreal and in Regina, Edmonton and Winnipeg, and in Vancouver.

Mr. BROOKS: It is becoming more of a problem all the time.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: But we are trying to get them to work more closely with the hospitals or have them located as near to the hospitals as possible. I might ask Dr. Warner, who is the director of treatment services, to express his views on that particular point.

Dr. W. P. WARNER (*Director General, Treatment Services*): What you say is perfectly true, it is a real problem, and it is a growing problem. What has been stressed is the high acute illness rate among them whereby about 50 per cent should be under active hospital treatment to get the best treatment. Any accommodation that is built for them should be close to an active treatment hospital therefore, where they can be shuttled back and forth. But the second point to be considered, which I think is more important, is that it is pretty common thinking nowadays that by and large most of these older people are much happier and healthier if they stay on "civvie street" rather than being put in a home; although, mind you, there are circumstances in which they are not and where they would be better in a home. But by and large if you can improve conditions and perhaps just leave them alone, in the long haul, they will be happier and healthier in "civvie street."

With that idea in mind, about four years ago, we set up what we call assessment and rehabilitation units, and we have them in hospitals all across Canada. These units consist of an internist that is a physician, a psychologist, and a social worker and sometimes a welfare worker or, if he is not in the unit, he is accessible. All the applicants for this custodial care, this old age home treatment, are interviewed through this unit and an attempt is made through the welfare service to keep them in "civvie street" or to put them here. But if conditions are such that you cannot do this, then he comes in. I do not know what policy is followed in Australia, but I am aware of the British program.

In Britain the old peoples' homes are in proximity—at least they are at Oxford—to the active treatment hospital and their thinking is the same, too, that by and large, the veteran is happier and healthier if he is out on "civvie street".

Mr. BROOKS: I understand they have a sort of a little village system where there are doctors and nurses and they have recreational services for them, and the old people, the old veterans, have all their requirements met.

Dr. WARNER: In the Oxford unit the hospital is right close to it.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In connection with this subject the annual report says on page 17, the second paragraph:

> At March 31, 1954, 12,977 World War I and dual service veterans were registered for employment with the Unemployment Insurance Commission, an increase of 3,842 over the same date in 1953.

Have you the figures for March 31, 1955?

Mr. HELLYER: While you are looking up the figures, perhaps you could tell us if there are any special studies being made in the field of geriatrics in Toronto or in any of the other centres?

Dr. WARNER: Yes, sir. The two chief studies are being carried on in Toronto, at Sunnybrook, and in Montreal. We have one of the best rehabilitation units for screening these people, and they try to rehabilitate them and keep them on "civvie street". Then, if they should be hospitalized, they have three stages. They have the Red Chevron, then they have the H.N.O. centre were they are

semi-ambulant, and then they have a block in Sunnybrook where the patients are really bed fast—really sick—and the idea is that the unit tries to increase their activity. That is the other point. They are better off on "civvie street" and if you have got to put them in hospital you try to keep them busy. You build them up from bed patients to semi-ambulant until you can get them out. There is a geriatrics research project at Sunnybrook which is the only one of its kind. They are trying to find out how to assess how old you are. That is, if you are a youngster we know what you would be like at ages 1, 2 and 3, but when you get to the peak one does not know how to figure out functionally whether you are 55 or 90. They are doing a long term study on this.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you not think that it is dangerous to go into that with members of parliament?

Mr. HELLYER: I think this is a very interesting subject.

Dr. WARNER: The Treasury Board this year wanted a report from the Sunnybrook hospital so that they could tell when to fire civil servants and we told them we would give them a report 10 years from now.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Churchill, the answer to your question is 11,338.

I think Mr. MacLean asked for the figures of the number of blind veterans under care with the National Institute for the Blind. The total is 328 broken down as follows: World War I, 128, World War II, 198, and Korean veterans 2.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you have a question, Mr. Cameron?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Mr. Chairman, when I was on the coast at Easter I had some complaints of veterans suffering from tuberculosis being removed from the Shaughnessy hospital and being sent to Tranquille. These complaints were on the basis that it made it almost impossible for the families to visit them. I wonder if the minister could tell us what the policy is in that respect?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe that Dr. Warner will be able to answer your question.

Dr. WARNER: It is departmental policy that we do not treat tuberculosis cases if there are adequate provincial facilities. Right after the war in British Columbia and in many other provinces you could not get a bed at a sanatorium. Now, the treatment sanitoria are getting empty and our people are going back. The second reason is we are short of beds at the Shaughnessy hospital and we need the beds for other purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is there any difference in the effect, shall I say, on the veteran's pension and allowance whether he is in Shaughnessy or in the provincial institution?

Dr. WARNER: No. Tranquille is a good sanitorium.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I know. The complaint which I received was that for many of these older veterans it makes it impossible for their families to visit them. I was wondering whether in the case where there is little hope of recovery you make any exceptions?

Dr. WARNER: We do and I would be glad to consider any such cases which you may know of.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 513, "Operations of Hospitals and Administration". The details are on page 614.

Mr. BROOKS: May we have a general statement on that item, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I was not prepared to give any general statement, but if I might ask Dr. Warner he may like to tell you what takes place under that particular vote.

Dr. WARNER: That is a large order.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Have you anything particular in mind, Colonel Brooks?

Mr. BROOKS: No, except just a general picture.

Mr. ENFIELD: I would like to know first of all just who is entitled to the free use of veterans hospitals, and secondly who is entitled to any consideration from veterans hospitals where there is free service or other types of assistance?

Dr. WARNER: Dr. Misener will tell you about that.

Dr. C. C. MISENER (*Director, Admission Services, Treatment Services, Department of Veterans Affairs*): Mr. Chairman, those entitled to treatment are pensioners for their pensioned condition. In addition veterans who are recipients of war veterans allowance. There is certain immediate post-discharge treatment given. The quantity after World War II was very large. Those benefits were extended to the Korean veteran. Domiciliary care is provided to veterans who are totally disabled and who have certain service. In general those are the main classes of treatment. In addition, of course, the department provides all the treatment for the R.C.M.P. It provides a large part of the treatment for the serving members of the forces. On a discretionary basis treatment is provided to veterans who had overseas service and an honorable discharge or who are in receipt of pension, and to ex-members of the Imperial and allied forces under similar circumstances who had domicile at the beginning of the war in Canada or a total of 20 years residence in Canada. Under this section of treatment mental diseases are not treated, nor is tuberculosis ordinarily treated in a sanitorium, as well as alcoholism and drug addiction. Treatment is provided in Canada only and there may be a charge for this treatment in accordance with a sliding scale. A charge can be made in respect of assets over certain amounts and in respect of adjusted incomes. The veteran is not eligible if his adjusted income is over $2500. Any veteran without special service requirements can be treated in a departmental hospital, if there is room, and if he cannot receive the treatment free under the regulations in which case he pays the account. There are various miscellaneous groups of a smaller nature.

The CHAIRMAN: This is all included in an over-all treatment regulation?

Dr. MISENER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: And that would be available to the members of the committee I suppose if they wanted an actual copy of the treatment regulations.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We can have copies mimeographed. These are the treatment regulations which I think cover 25 pages. We can have that done but I assure you that they are not easy to understand.

Mr. ENFIELD: I think that the expense would be unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest that we might make 5 or 6 copies available to the clerk and anyone who wished could look it over.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We had, a few months ago, a pamphlet printed which some of the members here probably have seen. It is entitled "If Sickness Strikes", and it gives a pretty comprehensive explanation of the various entitlements for treatment. It does not cover everything, but I think it does give a pretty comprehensive explanation. We can have that distributed at the next meeting. Would that be satisfactory?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be a very good idea.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As I say we can have the whole treatment regulations run off and distributed, but I think that members will find it pretty heavy going. As the deputy minister points out the pamphlet has the great advantage of not being in legal language. After reading it I found the most eloquent part of it was on the last page where it gave the address of the district officials and said "For further explanation apply there".

The CHAIRMAN: If that is agreed we will have a copy of the regulations left with the clerk and if anyone wants to go over any point after looking at the pamphlet they can look it up in the regulations.

Mr. ENFIELD: I asked the question because I wondered who could get in a veterans hospital and now I realize that I never will understand.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Roughly speaking a pensioner for his pensioned disability, a recipient of war veterans allowances and the indigent veteran, can get in for treatment.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): In Dr. Misener's evidence is there a distinction made in that a recipient of war veterans allowance can be hospitalized for any illness but that a recipient of a military pension can only be hospitalized for the disability for which he received his pension?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Unless he qualifies as an indigent.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I see.

Mr. BROOKS: If his disability is over a certain percentage he is hospitalized no matter what his other ailment is?

Dr. MISENER: If treatment is required for the pension disability even though he may be receiving war veterans allowance he is put in the section applicable to treatment of the pension disability which involves payment of treatment allowance. If a recipient of war veterans allowance goes in there is free treatment for any non-pensioned condition.

Mr. BROOKS: Did I understand you to say that in mental cases you used the facilities of the different provinces and not the veterans hospitals?

Dr. MISENER: That is the principle, although the department does operate two mental hospitals.

Mr. BROOKS: There are provincial hospitals and my point is this: some of the poorer provinces I know cannot afford to have as good facilities to look after mental cases as the richer provinces. Would these cases of soldiers mentally ill be sent to the best hospitals in the country or would they be sent to their own provincial hospitals?

Dr. MISENER: They are treated locally as far as possible. Therefore, if a Saskatchewan patient requires mental treatment he will be treated in one of the provincial mental hospitals.

Mr. BROOKS: You send them then to the provincial hospitals mostly?

Dr. MISENER: Yes, except where we have our own mental hospitals. We have one at London, Ontario and one at Ste. Anne de Bellevue.

Mr. BROOKS: What cases would you send to London or to Ste. Anne de Bellevue and what cases to provincial hospitals?

Dr. MISENER: The mental cases requiring treatment in Ontario would be sent to London as long as beds were available there. In Quebec they would be sent to Ste. Anne's.

Mr. BROOKS: It seems to me that there is a bit of discrimination there because those hospitals I know are much better than some of the provincial hospitals?

Dr. WARNER: There are special cases sent from other provinces to both London and Ste. Anne's, but not many. However, there are some. It did not

seem wise for the department to go into the business of treating psychiatric people if the province could do it.

Mr. BROOKS: I do not like to mention this, but I was thinking of our provincial hospital in New Brunswick. I know that it is not up to the standard of the two you have mentioned. I was wondering why mental cases of soldiers in New Brunswick should not be treated in these other hospitals where they could get the best treatment?

Dr. WARNER: They are not all sent, but New Brunswick does send more to Ste. Anne's and Westminster than I think any other province. Quite a few are sent there.

Mr. MICHENER: What are the statistics of cost at the departmental hospitals on the basis of patient days or the way in which the hospitals make up their cost figures?

The CHAIRMAN: How long will it take to give that information?

Mr. MACE: About five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that this is entering a new phase and as we make a practice of adjourning at 12.30 we will now adjourn to meet tomorrow at 3.30.

Mr. BRYCE: Would the minister be able to get a copy of the wages paid in the 12 hospitals across the country, the various rates for nurses, kitchen maids, cooks and chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN: The meeting will now adjourn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 24

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

WITNESSES:

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, and Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services, both of Treatment Services; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955

57295—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey North*)
Blair
Brooks
Bryce
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Garland
Habel
Hanna
Hellyer
Lapointe
MacEachen
MacLean
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Yuill
Weselak

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

THURSDAY, April 21, 1955.

Ordered,—

That the name of Mr. Blair be substituted for that of Mr. Monteith; and

That the name of Mr. Weselak be substituted for that of Mr. Jutras on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, April 22, 1955.
(30)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett, (*Grey North*), Brooks, Blair, Byrne, Bryce, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Churchill, Enfield, Garland, Habel, Hellyer, Lapointe, MacLean, McLeod, Power (*St. John's West*), Yuill, and Weselak.

In attendance: From the Department of Veterans Affairs: Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Director of Finance and Stores; Dr. W. P. Warner, Director General, and Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services; both of Treatment Services; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; and Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

The Chairman being unavoidably absent, Mr. Bennett (*Grey North*) moved, seconded by Mr. Enfield,—

That Mr. Hellyer be Chairman of the Committee for this sitting.

There being no other nominations, Mr. Hellyer was declared elected as Acting Chairman.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

The Deputy Minister presented, for distribution, copies of a booklet relating to "Treatment for Veterans for Non-Pensioned Conditions".

Tables, showing salary and wage scales for various classes of employees in certain areas, were also distributed.

Items numbered 513 to 517 inclusive, were adopted.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m., Monday, April 25.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

57295—1½

PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, April 22, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. HELLYER (*Acting Chairman*): Gentlemen, thank you for this expression of your confidence. We were discussing item 513 and I think the minister has the answers to some questions, which were asked previously, which he would like to present before we continue.

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (*Minister of Veterans Affairs*): First of all, I have here the pamphlet to which I referred yesterday entitled "Should Illness Strike," which deals with treatment for veterans for non-pensioned conditions, published by the Department of Veterans Affairs. This gives some information on the treatment regulations. I will ask that this be distributed.

I believe it was Mr. Bryce who towards the close of the meeting yesterday asked to be provided with the rates of salaries of certain employees in our hospitals; namely, hospital nurses, hospital cooks, hospital maids and chauffeurs. This is rather a lengthy list and I wonder if it would be agreeable for me to have it distributed, and it could be added as an appendix to the record of today's evidence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable, Mr. Bryce?

Mr. BRYCE: I would like to see it now.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will have it distributed now. At the same time I will have another document distributed showing the number of employees in each of these classifications in our various hospitals. I am sorry; I am told that the second list is broken down by districts rather than by individual institutions.

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen from a perusal of the first document which was distributed, the one entitled "salary and wage scales," that hospital nurses and hospital cooks hold civil service classified appointments, whereas the hospital maids and chauffeurs are under prevailing rates, and are therefore prevailing rate employees. The salaries of hospital nurses and hospital cooks are the same throughout the country, but a variation exists in the salaries of maids and chauffeurs who are paid the prevailing rates in the various localities.

Mr. BRYCE: What I am asking you about is this. I am not going to go into this in detail, but I just want to get some information. I notice that in Halifax a maid receives $876 but in Vancouver for the same work a maid receives $1,560. It does not seem reasonable to me that the government should permit this. Of all people, the government should be the people who equalize wages and endeavour to keep people contented. I notice that in Toronto a maid receives $1,344, but the same individual in Winnipeg receives only $1,068. That would create a lot of dissatisfaction. I think Canadians are pretty well equal. I do not think the Vancouver people are so much better than the rest—

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Some are more equal than others!

Mr. BRYCE: —I did not notice my Vancouver friend here, but I repeat again that I do not think that anybody in Vancouver is better than anyone else.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It would appear that out in Vancouver people are more equal than others.

I can only repeat what I said yesterday that the prevailing rate employees are paid the rate which is paid in the particular locality in which they live, and

it varies throughout the country. Another thing which I might have pointed out yesterday, is that the department as such is not the one that determines first, what appointments will be civil service classified appointments and what appointments will be prevailing rate appointments; and secondly, in the case of the prevailing rate, what salary will be paid. The question of determining what is to constitute a civil service classified appointment rather than a prevailing rate appointment is done by the civil service under the Civil Service Act. Secondly, the rates paid to prevailing rates employees are arrived at by the Treasury Board following a survey made by the Department of Labour. This is a survey which is continuously going on. Therefore, an employee who is a member of the civil service will only receive an increase when there is a general increase in civil service salaries, whereas prevailing rate employees may have adjustments in their pay during the course of the year, every year possibly, depending on the result of that continuous survey which is made by the Department of Labour.

Mr. BRYCE: Well, Mr. Minister, your argument is that—

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not arguing, I am giving the facts.

Mr. BRYCE: But the facts as you express them reveal that a hospital nurse in Vancouver or in Halifax receives the same wage or the same salary in the same grade?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct.

Mr. BRYCE: And the same applies to cooks?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: But when you come to the hospital maids and chauffeurs, you divide them up on a different basis altogether, and you go to the Minister of Labour and ask him how much is being paid in that district, is that right?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We do not go to the Minister of Labour. The Department of Labour tells us and tells the Civil Service Commission what rates of pay should apply in a locality for prevailing rate employees. Therefore we might be advised tomorrow, for instance, that in some of these appointments, in Winnipeg the rate should be increased by so much, and in Halifax it should be increased by so much. The Department of Labour is the one that advises the Civil Service Commission and the department.

Mr. BRYCE: Well, I am not going to hold up the committee any longer. I do not think it is fair. I think this is something which should be corrected and if speaking to the Minister of Labour will do any good I will do that myself.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Before we leave this matter I would like to get one point clear. Do I understand that the Department of Veterans Affairs has no control at all over the salaries which are paid to the civil service classification employees?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct. We may recommend, but the Civil Service Commission is the one which decides.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Is that the case with regard to the prevailing rate employees? Does your department decide what should be given to the hospital maids and so forth?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. We are advised by the Civil Service Commission whose advice is based on that survey made by the Department of Labour.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): They set the rate?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right. We are told to pay so much an hour.

Mr. BROOKS: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the same principle applies to the other departments of the government as applies in this case?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, exactly the same principle.

Mr. BRYCE: I have not found out yet why there should be sauce for the goose and not for the gander.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is illogical that if a person has the good luck to fall into the classification of a permanent civil servant the same rate should be paid right across the country, but if he is a public servant not under that classification he must take what the Department of Labour is pleased to tell him is the prevailing rate in his area. I was thinking that if that rule applied in every branch of public service I would be getting a far smaller indemnity than my friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Cameron). I do not think that is fair.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): A sound idea!

Mr. POWER: Surely a chauffeur's services are as good in Saint John's as in Vancouver.

Mr. BRYCE: A nursemaid or a kitchen maid need only work half as long in Halifax to earn what they earn in Vancouver.

Mr. BROOKS: No one can tell me it costs just as much to live in Vancouver as Halifax.

Mr. BRYCE: As a matter of fact I checked the cost of living index last night and I found it costs as much to live in the one city as in the other.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think the consumer's index has anything to do with it.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): I do not know if the minister is a member of the Treasury Board but if he is he might point out this inequity.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a recognized fact there are discrepancies in the rates of pay in all trades across the country. I think Mr. Bryce will admit that the rates of pay for various trades throughout Canada vary in each province, and even within a province they vary within the various localities. We hire a man—we take him up in the street and start him as a chauffeur; we pay him the rate of pay which is the normal rate in the locality where he is going to work.

Mr. YUILL: The department would be open to criticism if they paid a different rate to the prevailing rate.

Mr. BYRNE: I think this is a most amazing document. I have been of the impression that there was some justification for the variations due to the high cost of living, and so on, but I think a difference of 100 per cent between Halifax and Vancouver does seem unreasonable. Is it possible that there are some other benefits such as board or rooms which would be included at Halifax while at Vancouver it might be that those things are the responsibility of the employes, who have to find their own?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. That would not be the case. Actually the maids get their meals at the hospital. The chauffeurs may get some meals, depending on the hours they work.

Mr. BROOKS: Would not living in the Maritimes be a consideration over living in Vancouver?

An hon. MEMBER: Living east of Montreal would be.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: May I again point out that the department does not fix these rates. They are based on the rates of pay in the locality.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On advice from the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The Civil Service Commission's decision, I understand, is based on the survey made by the Department of Labour.

Mr. CHURCHILL: And if the argument is to be pursued it should be pursued with the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I would think so.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have one or two general questions about Treatment Services, but they are dependent on the meaning of the word "admissions" and before I ask the questions I would like to know what you mean by admissions to hospital. Does it mean that a person becomes a patient and stays in the hospital for more than one day? How is it determined?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: A patient has to be admitted into a hospital for at least one day.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In other words, a person who goes in just for an X-ray and is there for an hour is not considered an admission.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. He is considered an out-patient. He has to be admitted into a hospital for treatment for at least twenty-four hours.

Mr. CHURCHILL: My questions then are with regard to the material which appears on page 22 of the annual report, where I notice that one-fifth of all admissions and discharges in departmental institutions are of members of the armed forces, and in the reports of the preceding two years that same statement is made. When you look over on page 23 you find that the number of admissions to departmental hospital during 1953-54 is slightly over 50,000. That would mean that one-fifth of that number—10,000 members of the armed forces—are admitted to departmental hospitals. I was wondering how that comes about in view of the fact that our armed forces have an approximate strength of 100,000. I presume that 20,000 are, or have been, overseas or afloat. The armed forces employ approximately 400 medical officers and there are hospital facilities overseas. We would have, then, about 80,000 members of the armed forces who would receive attention in Canada. How does it come about that the rate of admission is so high for that particular group?

Dr. W. P. WARNER (*Director, Treatment Services, Department of Veterans Affairs*): There are two ways in which armed forces personnel are admitted to D. V. A. hospitals. One is for what is called definitive care, that is to say base hospital care. That is for complicated examinations, major surgery and so on. That is a base hospital, and the government has decreed that D.V.A. hospitals will be the base hospitals for the armed services in Canada—that is, that the armed services will not build these hospitals across the country, except in one or two instances. That is one way and that concerns about one per cent or one and a half per cent of the personnel in Canada. You count that the definitive or base hospitals have one or one and a half per cent of the people in the forces—cases where they are admitted. Then in three hospitals—in London, Toronto and Quebec—the armed forces have an actual block of beds. That is in Sunnybrook there are 100 beds and in Westminster 75 to 100 and the same at Ste-Foye in Quebec. In these blocks not only do the armed services put in 1½ per cent of definitive but may put in the slight illnesses which run about twice the definitive; about 3 to 4 per cent, that is the sickness rate of the armed services. As a matter of fact the admissions for 1954-55 from the armed services were 11,500, and in 1951 they were 9,000, 1952 10,000, 1953 10,000, and this year have gone up to 11,000.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What I wondering about is that these people are not admitted into the armed services until they have passed a strict medical test. Does this rate of admission correspond to the rate of admission for the ordinary civilian population or is it much lower?

Dr. WARNER: It does not correspond in that the civilian population are close to home and a lot of them can be looked after at home. The figures I gave you are what occurred in World War II and in the armed services throughout the world. It is lower in civilian cases because a lot of these people stay at home for illnesses whereas serving personnel have to go some place.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The service comprises that portion of the adult population which to the layman is considered to be the more healthy population.

Dr. WARNER: Those statistics apply to all armed services of all countries.

Mr. MACLEAN: Do the armed services not receive hospitalization for minor treatment at accommodation on their bases?

Dr. WARNER: They look after the 1 and 1½ per cent except in London, Toronto and Quebec. In those three places we look after the 3 per cent, but in other places they look after the minor half, 1½ per cent.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The report goes on to mention the number and says that the monthly average in hospital for the year was 567. Is that reasonable under these circumstances for the armed services?

Dr. WARNER: Yes. The 1st of April it was 802—going up.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I wonder what would be the nature of the illnesses in general terms. After all, there is another factor I presume in the present army, that the same series of inoculations are carried on as prevailed during wartime. Is there any breakdown as to the troubles from which these people are suffering?

Dr. WARNER: I do not have them here. The armed services would have them.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Is the Department of Veterans Affairs, which appears to be so largely responsible for the hospitalization of the armed services, reimbursed financially for this expenditure?

Dr. WARNER: Yes, a block grant each year.

Mr. BROOKS: We often hear that there is not accommodation in our veterans hospitals for all the veterans who wish to apply. Is that the situation today?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not the situation today.

Mr. BROOKS: Our hospitals can look after the veterans and also the members of the armed services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS: Another question I have has reference to the patient day cost across the country for care of our veterans in the hospitals; the cost in each district or in each veterans hospital across the country. I would like to see a comparison.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will ask Mr. Mace to answer.

Mr. MACE: Colonel Brooks could let me know whether you are going to compare the figure I give with our recovery rate?

Mr. BROOKS: I would like to get a comparison with the cost for instance in Halifax and Vancouver. We know it costs more for help in Vancouver; what would be the cost of hospitalization in Vancouver and Halifax?

Mr. MACE: The average cost for 1953-54—I do not have any later figures. You mentioned Halifax and where?

Mr. BROOKS: The hospitals right across the country are what I would like to have.

Mr. MACE: This is the average cost per patient a day for our active treatment institutions only: Camp Hill $13.22, Lancaster $13.20, Quebec $14.90, Queen Mary Veterans' Hospital $17.56, Ste. Anne's $8.19, Sunnybrook $12.63, Westminster $9.68, Deer Lodge $12.34, Saskatoon Veterans' Hospital $9.62, Colonel Belcher Hospital, Calgary, $13.23, Shaughnessy Hospital, Vancouver, $11.64, Victoria Veterans Hospital $11.10, and St. Hyacinthe's Veterans' Hospital—

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Is closed.

Mr. MACE: Our average per diem rates for recovery purposes for the same year were $12.55.

Mr. BRYCE: You have no explanation why Vancouver is cheaper when they pay higher wages?

Mr. MACE: Part of the reason is due to the fact that we have a very high occupancy rate at Shaughnessy of 83 per cent which leads to more patient days, more patients and a slightly lower cost.

Mr. BROOKS: Civilian hospitals have a great difficulty in keeping up nursing staff. Are they having the same difficulty in veterans hospitals?

Dr. WARNER: Yes sir. There are local conditions in Vancouver because the civilian hospitals pay so much that we have trouble getting nurses and in Calgary it is the same thing.

There are lots of nurses in Halifax, and in Quebec we have difficulty in Montreal. We will get along all right expect for local spots of difficulty.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There is an item on page 27 of the annual report. Does that explain the comment? It seems to indicate that you have had to fall back on some untrained or semi-trained help for nursing service?

Dr. WARNER: Team nursing. As you know team nursing is a relatively new thing in which there is a graduate nurse with a team under her which consist of male orderlies and nursing assistants or what were called practical nurses. A registered nurse would have two orderlies or two nursing assistants with only ten months training instead of the usual three years. That is a team which I think originally was designed to aid the shortage of registered nurses. You can do more nursing with this team with one registered nurse than if you did not have the team and had two or three nurses. It has been found it is much more efficient nursing because it takes away from registered nurses the duties of making beds, cleaning up and running messages. It gets a group of people who stay with the same patient. Under the old system a nurse would come on and in a few days would be gone. This group stay with the same patient.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Do they do that training in your hospitals?

Dr. WARNER: This nursing group?

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Yes.

Dr. WARNER: Yes, at Sunnybrook, Montreal and Halifax.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): You mentioned that in some places there is a considerable discrepancy in the salaries which are paid by way of wages in civilian hospitals and in departmental hospitals. Is that true also with respect to hospital matrons?

Dr. WARNER: I am not sure that I can answer you correctly, but I think it is.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): It seemed to me to be rather modest salaries for experienced hospital matrons.

Dr. WARNER: My impression is that the discrepancy is not as great in the case of matrons as it is in the case of nurses.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What are medical social workers?

Dr. WARNER: A medical social worker is a person, usually a woman, who has gone to university and obtained a B.A. degree in the vast majority of cases, and then spends two years in post graduate work. It is quite a high educational standard.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Post graduate work in what?

Dr. WARNER: In social services. She gets her B.A. at university and then spends two years in post graduate work in social services.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There are special courses for that?

Dr. WARNER: Yes. In the olden days, when a doctor worked in general practice, he would know everybody and know all the circumstances, be they mental, physical, spiritual, and everything else concerning the family. He would know that. But now you may take a chap from North Bay and "shoot" him into Sunnybrook and there the doctor does not know what the circumstances are which may affect his life.

The medical social worker is trained to dig them out, and if necessary she will make a trip to his home, and report back to the doctor, and will say: "These are the circumstances which make it difficult for him to go home; he wants to stay in hospital and be sick. Here are the circumstances which may be corrected, and it will do the fellow good."

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the explanation between the large variation in the amount of recoveries for treatment in the various hospitals per bed. I see that Camp Hill hospital has 550 beds, and the amount of recovery for treatment was $120,000 in round figures.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Just what are you reading from?

Mr. MACLEAN: From the public accounts of last year at page ZZ-7.

The Lancaster hospital in Saint John has one hundred beds less, that is, it has 450 beds, yet the amount recovered was about 80 per cent more.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Is not the answer to that the number of recoverable cases we have from National Defence?

The variation reflects the number of recoverable cases that come into the hospitals. For instance, in the case of Lancaster, the service personnel from Gagetown would be going to Lancaster. Depending on the number of patients which are not departmental patients but which are sent by other departments to hospital, the amount of recoverable money would vary. And also there would be a number of patients under section 23, where the veteran pays for his hospitalization in a veterans hospital.

Mr. BROOKS: But Gagetown was not in operation then.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It would reflect them.

Mr. BROOKS: It is only getting into operation now.

Mr. MACLEAN: Roughly, where the recovery rate is high, it means that the ratio of service patients is also high in that hospital.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, you would probably find that at the end of this year in the Quebec hospital, Ste-Foy, which has slightly over 300 beds, there is a very high proportion, because 75 of those beds are always filled with service people from Valcartier.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have a couple of questions on a different matter. We have all agreed to the fact that the regulations covering what a veteran is entitled to receive in the way of treatment are pretty complicated. What precautions are taken especially in the smaller hospitals to see to it that the veterans who are admitted there are receiving everything to which they are entitled, in other words, that they do not inadvertently think they are not entitled to something and do not get it or apply for it?

Dr. C. C. MISENER (Department of Veterans Affairs): When a veteran is admitted to our hospitals, the Admission Services people are instructed to explain to him very carefully just what benefits he is entitled to while he is there. For instance, if he is eligible for an allowance, he is told by means of a "chit" what allowance he and his family will receive. If, on the other hand, he gets no allowance but might be eligible for comforts and clothing, that is explained to him. If on the other hand, there might be a charge against him, that is explained to him before he is actually admitted to a bed if possible, that is, if he is in a physical condition at that time to accept the explanation.

Mr. MacLean: Under what circumstances—I may not be using the correct terms—is a helplessness allowance payable, when a veteran is completely helpless, though his condition may not be caused directly by pension entitlement? What are the circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Lapointe: That comes under the Pension Act and I shall ask Brigadier Melville to answer your question.

Mr. Melville: A pensioner is entitled to an award of helplessness allowance when he meets four conditions: first, he must be a pensioner; second, he must be totally disabled; third, he must be helpless; and fourth, he must be in need of attendance.

In so far as the pensioner is concerned, "pension" is defined in the Act; but we have the odd case of men whose disability may be, let us say, four per cent for which they would receive a single payment. That is defined in the Act as a pension. If such a man became totally disabled and helpless such as a paraplegic, he will receive the award of helplessness allowance.

The minimum amount is $480 a year and the maximum is $1,400. The $1,400 is paid to those who require constant attendance; for example, paraplegics. In the case of the blind, who maintain that they do not require constant attendance—they do not require it at night when they are sleeping; they are very independent—they get $960 per annum, which is $80 per month.

Mr. MacLean: What treatments are pensioners entitled to in the way of dental treatment?

Mr. Misener: Eligibility for dental treatment is the same as for medical treatment.

Mr. Brooks: They get dental plates free if they are required.

Mr. Misener: Subject to all those qualifications.

Mr. Blair: On page 18 of the green booklet entitled "Should Illness Strike", part II, it says:

> Must Payment be Guaranteed.
>
> Arrangements for payment, satisfactory to the Department, must be made by, or on behalf of, a veteran before admission to hospital for examination or treatment.
>
> These arrangements may include the assignment of any benefits to which the veteran is entitled under any insurance policy or hospital or medical service prepayment plan.

That brings up this question: What are you going to do with a veteran who simply has not anything and who tries to get into a veterans hospital? It is the old story. What are you going to do with him under this Act where payment must be guaranteed?

Fellows do turn up who have not got anything. They turn up for medical supplies and hospitalization. They turn up in the ordinary civilian hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Lapointe: If he does not have anything, in the case you mentioned Dr. Blair, he would qualify for treatment under section 13, which is part one of this pamphlet.

Mr. Blair: I just want to get this clear; that is the top one there. I just have not got that clear, because on page 18 it says payment must be guaranteed.

Mr. Mace: That is for hospitalization under Section 23.

Hon. Mr. Lapointe: Yes. Section 23 is the section concerning treatment regulations which permits a veteran who is not admissible for free treatment to be treated in a veterans' hospital by paying for his treatment as he would in an ordinary civilian hospital. Section 13 will permit an indigent veteran

to enter a veterans hospital and be treated without charge or if he has a certain income there will be a charge according to a sliding scale which appears on page 10.

Mr. BROOKS: Could we get some idea as to the number of indigent patients admitted to the hospital under section 13?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, we have that.

Mr. BROOKS: Perhaps you would give it to us by districts?

Mr. MACE: I cannot give it to you by districts, sir. The total number of Section 13 in-patients as at March 29, 1955, was 602.

Mr. BLAIR: I am not just clear on this indigent idea yet. The thing I bring up is this. Every once in a while some wanderer whose papers show he is a veteran is admitted, and then the argument starts. The local hospital is probably full, and someone suggests that because he is without doubt an old soldier he should be sent to a veterans hospital. What I am concerned about is that that man gets a fair deal. He probably has good service, the authorities in the local hospital say, "Send him to veterans hospital," and then the race starts about what you are going to do with him. It is pretty hard to dispose of those chaps. I would like some direction on just what you are going to do with those people?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: If he is an indigent?

Mr. BLAIR: Obviously he is an indigent. Doubtless he is picked up or has taken sick in the jail or is found ill in a railway station or something like that.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: On page 5 of the pamphlet you will see who is eligible under section 13, and any veteran who has the qualifying service which is mentioned on page 6, and who is indigent gets free treatment, but he has to have overseas service.

Mr. BLAIR: Yes, but if that were proved, you would be willing to accept him?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh yes.

Mr. BLAIR: But on the other hand if he is forced, or if his condition is such that it is necessary that he goes into an ordinary town hospital, is he a municipal charge—which you would not like to see him be—or will the D.V.A. pay for his treatment if he is in a local hospital? I have had those cases, and I am concerned about that.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: What usually happens in a case like that is this. If there is a veterans hospital in the locality or in the region the civilian hospital will and does communicate with the veterans hospital, and if we find that this man has service which qualifies him for free treatment, he will be moved to our hospital unless his condition is such that the act of moving him would prove serious, in which case he would probably remain in the civilian hospital. In this case, my understanding is that we would pay the civilian hospital.

Mr. BLAIR: You would reimburse the hospital then?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BLAIR: I just wanted to get that clear.

Mr. ENFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it could be stated at what percentage of its capacity Sunnybrook hospital is operating?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It varies during the year.

Mr. ENFIELD: Yes. I noticed there were 8,769 patients admitted during the year.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will ask Mr. Mace to answer that.

Mr. MACE: During 1954-55 the patient load based on the normal bed capacity of the hospital was 74·9 per cent and 81·2 per cent of the operating capacity of the hospital.

Mr. BLAIR: You would then consider that hospital full at 74 per cent?

Mr. MACE: Yes; and very certainly at 80 per cent.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MacLEAN: No, Mr. Chairman. In the Charlottetown district there is no veterans hospital; that is, no separate veterans hospital as such, but each of the two hospitals there have a veterans' wing. Where do the expenses for that appear? Are they classified as outside hospitals?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We call them contract hospitals.

Mr. MacLEAN: Is the rate paid for accommodation in contract hospitals the same rate across the country, or does it vary from district to district?

Mr. MACE: Sir, the department follows the practice of paying individual hospitals the rates charged to the public plus extras at the departmental schedule fees with the exception that in the case of provincial institutions, and I am referring to mental institutions and T.B. sanitoriums, the department usually reimburses the provinces on the basis of cost.

Mr. MacLEAN: Well, in the case of these independent hospitals, what is actually charged to civilian patients? Some of them operate at a loss and are able to give a certain rate only because they receive contributions from time to time.

Mr. MACE: That is so, sir, but the fact remains that apparently any outside hospitals where we place veterans are prepared to accept the going rate. That practice has been followed for some years with the exception of the provincial institutions and where we may have a veterans' pavilion, such as here in Ottawa, and then it is accounted for on a cost basis. In those cases, the annual statement is subjected to departmental audit.

Mr. MacLEAN: In the case of the hospitals in Charlottetown, what classification would they come under? Are they the same as the pavilion here?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, we own the pavilion here in Ottawa.

Mr. MacLEAN: It strikes me on the face of it that in a situation of that sort the local hospital which is contracted to treat veterans is actually subsidizing their treatment in cases where they operate at a loss and where their fees do not cover the cost?

Mr. MACE: Generally speaking the veterans in those hospitals get semi-private accommodation, because usually they are seriously ill patients, and as you know, in most civilian hospitals, semi and private ward rates are established to carry the public wards or certainly are usually in excess of the actual per diem cost of operating the hospital.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Garland?

Mr. GARLAND: I do not wish to take up too much of the committee's time, but it seems to me this is a rather important point. The hospitals no doubt know what they are doing, but it seems to me that in the case—I think it would be true in the case of both the hospitals in Charlottetown—that surely they must be treating these veterans at a loss to themselves?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, they fix the rate, we do not. They tell us what the rate is, and what they want us to pay.

Mr. GARLAND: But it was just said that the rate was the same rate charged to ordinary civilian patients?

Mr. LALONDE: That is because they want it that way.

Mr. MACE: It must be remembered, sir, in the case of the Charlottetown hospitals—I am not too sure of the year, but some considerable time ago—the department made a grant to the Charlottetown General hospital of $75,000, and a grant of $75,000 to the Charlottetown sanitorium.

Mr. GARLAND: Well, that is probably the explanation of it.

Mr. MACE: I suggest that was sufficient inducement for them to accept our patients in future at the going rate.

Mr. GARLAND: The staff of those veterans' wings are all actually civilian hospital staff?

Mr. MACE: That is so.

Mr. GARLAND: The department does not supply nurses or any employees?

Mr. MACE: No.

Mr. GARLAND: I wonder about those areas and the smaller cities across the country where there is not a veterans hospital as such, and those areas where there might be two main hospitals, what policy or pattern is followed, or is there an attempt to divide the business between the two organizations?

Dr. WARNER: It is, sir, except that if the department—as I understand it—had made a grant of $75,000 or $100,000 for a wing in that hospital . . .

Mr. GARLAND: But where that does not exist—

Dr. WARNER: They try to divide it providing the services are equal.

Mr. GARLAND: So where both institutions are supported by public funds there is an attempt to divide it?

Dr. WARNER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: How do you reconcile that with the fact of the preference of the patient concerned?

Dr. WARNER: I would think those are two factors. I think the patient should go where he wants to go.

Mr. GARLAND: That is the first consideration; number one?

Dr. WARNER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: And all things being equal, it would be divided?

Dr. WARNER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND: I think in the figures that were given earlier there was a difference in the rates charged by the hospitals; is that a factor in deciding?

Dr. WARNER: No, I do not think so.

Mr. GARLAND: You gave us some figures concerning Montreal which were substantially different?

Dr. WARNER: Those are two of our own hospitals.

Mr. BROOKS: On page 618 it gives the cost of the operation of hospitals, and the administration, a figure of $45,581,123. Then there is an item subtracted from that, "Less amount recoverable for treatment of patients not the responsibility of the department." I take it that means the armed services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The armed forces; the R.C.M.P.; paying patients.

Mr. BROOKS: Could we have that amount divided up into the amounts that came from the army and the R.C.M.P.?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MACE: Colonel Brooks, these are the estimated figures for 1954-1955.

Mr. BROOKS: Perhaps you would give us the 1954-1955 figures. The estimate is for 1955-1956.

Mr. MACE: Would you like the latest figures I have which is an estimate for 1954-1955, as the complete figures for the year are not yet available.

Mr. BROOKS: Yes.

Mr. MACE: The total is $5,591,180 made up of $2 million for the maintenance of patients, that is paying patients including those sponsored by other government departments and other governments such as the British Ministry of Pensions; $22,000 for the sale of scrap; $245,000 for the sale of meals to staff; and $230,000 for laundry service—shall I say, sold by our own laundries to our own institutions?

Mr. BROOKS: The point I wanted to get was this. Are there many of the old veterans who can pay for hospitalization and have tken advantage of the veterans hospitals?

Mr. MACE: They would be in the $2 million figure, and I am afraid I cannot break it down to give you the exact information.

Mr. BROOKS: That is the amount I wanted broken up.

Mr. MACE: Do you want just Section 23, sir?

Mr. BROOKS: I wanted the item showing how many men were hospitalized from the army, how many from the R.C.M.P., and how many were paying patients, old veterans?

Mr. MACE: I was coming to the army. The recoveries from D.N.D. were $2,264,100; the R.C.M.P., $104,000. Now, contained within the figures for the maintenance of patients I could give you figures in respect to section 23. The charges for treatment for section 23 for 1954 were approximately $475,000.

Mr. BROOKS: You do not know the number of individuals?

Mr. MACE: Yes, I can give you the number of individuals. I think I could answer it to your satisfaction, sir, if I said there were approximately 125, "Section 23" patients in hospitals at all times.

Mr. BROOKS: 125?

Mr. MACE: Roughly. There were 126 at March 31.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: And about 500 under the indigent section.

Mr. BROOKS: With regard to that item of 500 in the indigent section—does that mean that there are 500 indigent patients in hospital at all times on an average?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Some of them may pay part of the cost of their hospitalization; others, nothing.

Mr. WESELAK: In the civilian hospitals in Manitoba and, I presume, in some of the other provinces a return is made in respect of public ward patients and a grant is made from the province at the rate of $1.50 or $2 a day in respect of them. I was wondering whether the same thing applied to civilians treated in other quarters.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that does not apply.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yuill, do you wish to ask a question?

Mr. YUILL: I have a peculiar case perhaps, in my own constituency where there are coal mines and a company has set up a hospital of their own to look after their staff. Among the patients who come in sooner or later are veterans of the first world war who have come back from the war and worked at mining before retiring on account of ill health or some other reason. But they have to go in periodically to that hospital, which is the only one within quite a distance, and they go in for minor check-ups or medical attention. When I was up there before the first of the year they were asking me just where they stood—if they had any claim for their services against this Veterans Affairs branch or whether it might be a charge against the province. What position do they find themselves in? They have a standard hospital there which is I suppose comparable with that of most rural hospitals. They have an x-ray

department and everything which goes with the ordinary rural hospital, but they apparently cannot collect from the Department of Veterans Affairs. Although it is a private hospital they seem to be bearing the cost of looking after these people. Is there not some way in which they could get the same consideration as privately-owned hospitals elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no reason why they should be considered differently from any other civilian hospital. Where is the hospital to which you are referring?

Mr. YUILL: It is at Mercoal in Alberta. I do not think the cases I have mentioned were serious cases, but the men required two or three days in the hospital while they were receiving medical attention. However, when it comes to meeting the bill these veterans generally are not in a position, perhaps where they are able to pay their own costs.

Mr. LALONDE: I take it, Mr. Yuill, that the veterans themselves are not eligible under the Treatment Regulations and that is why they go to a civilian hospital.

Mr. YUILL: I think they would be. I know some of them have served overseas and are veterans of the first world war, but I suppose that because they are there among friends they have chosen to live there. The bulk of the service which has been available for them up to now has been definitely "on the house" as far as the company hospital is concerned and I think they are anxious to know if there is any way for them to get the same consideration as the hospital at Edson, for instance, is receiving.

Mr. LALONDE: Is it a treatment for a pensionable disability which they require?

Mr. YUILL: I do not know.

Mr. LALONDE: That would be a matter which would have a bearing on the position—whether or not they have an entitlement to treatment.

Mr. YUILL: It would come more into the category, perhaps, of old age pensioners.

Mr. LALONDE: Are these people working?

Mr. YUILL: No, but after retirement they saw fit to stay on and live in the camp with their families and friends rather than move out of their usual environment.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, it would all depend on whether the individual qualifies for free treatment under section 13 which we referred to a little earlier this afternoon. It is impossible without knowing this to decide about these cases. There are certain conditions under which a veteran can get free treatment and if he gets it in a civilian hospital because there are no departmental facilities within reasonable distance, the hospital would be reimbursed, but if he does not meet these conditions he is in just the same position as another civilian. The fact that he is a veteran of the first war does not mean he will get free treatment in civilian hospitals, and that the hospitals will be reimbursed automatically by the department.

Mr. YUILL: The point is this—that if they do qualify they would get the same consideration in that hospital as elsewhere? Apparently they are getting it at Edson, but it was refused at Mercoal.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is all based on a veteran's qualifications and I would be very surprised if in the case you have referred to the veteran himself was qualified to get free treatment, but I will be very glad if you will refer any cases to us; we will be very pleased to look into the situation in that particular locality.

Mr. YUILL: I will be very glad to give you certain specific cases and you could put your yardstick on them.

Mr. MACLEAN: As far as civilian hospitals are concerned, are they classified by the American Hospital Association?

Dr. WARNER: It is the combined American Hospital Association, Canadian Hospital Association and Canadian Medical Association.

Mr. MACLEAN: Do these civilian hospitals have to reach a particular class or standard to qualify before they are able to receive remuneration for treating veterans?

Dr. WARNER: Where the treatment in one hospital is a lot better than in another a veteran goes to the one with the good facilities. If any of the hospitals come up to 100 per cent standards, it would be split. Does that answer your question?

Mr. MACLEAN: I think so.

Mr. BROOKS: What is the situation with regard to internship in veterans' hospitals? Is it the same as in civilian hospitals?

Dr. WARNER: Internship in veterans hospitals is different in one fundamental: we do not take junior doctor graduates. We will not have them. They have to go to another hospital where they get their pediatrics and obstetrics—we cannot give him that training—and we want them more mature.

Mr. BROOKS: He goes in as a junior—

Dr. WARNER: He comes in as a senior.

Mr. BROOK: I mean he goes in as a junior doctor in your hospital and gets the lowest rate of pay?

Dr. WARNER: That is right.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We do not take them in until they are fully qualified doctors.

Dr. WARNER: After a man has qualified and has had one year's experience elsewhere.

Mr. BROOKS: So there is really no such thing as internship?

Dr. WARNER: It is called internship or residency, but it is not a junior rotating internship, a year after graduation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried?

Carried.

Item 514—Medical Research and Education—$350,000

Mr. BRYCE: Is this research done in special hospitals set aside for it?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is done in various hospitals.

Mr. BRYCE: And is there one man or doctor appointed to supervise the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Dr. Warner has authority over all medical research and treatment in that department.

Dr. WARNER: There is research going on in practically every D.V.A. hospital and in each hospital there is a research committee of the doctors. There may be four or five of the local doctors in that hospital on the research committee and the staff who want to do research put in a project to this committee and say, "We want to do this research." They advise on it and if they think it is good they send it down here and that comes in from across Canada and once a year an advisory board sits, and once a year these projects are "vetted" and this advisory board on research, which is a pretty high-priced board, says, "All right, this project is passed, you can go ahead with it," or "This is no good, you won't be able to do it." That is the co-ordination.

Mr. BLAIR: Supposing a project was approved—would you get any contribution from the Department of National Health and Welfare?

Dr. WARNER: We are not allowed to take money for research from another government department, but if additional research was requested for the Department of National Defence and if our research budget is getting tight we can go to the Treasury board and get more funds.

Mr. BRYCE: But this $350,000 is your budget?

Dr. WARNER: That is right.

Mr. ENFIELD: I take it that there is research being carried on at Sunnybrook. Is there any liaison between Sunnybrook and the University of Toronto?

Dr. WARNER: Yes, there is very close liaison. There are certain research projects, part of which is being done at Sunnybrook and part at the Toronto hospital. It is tied up. A research project might begin in the university and it would be thought that the best way of continuing it would be at Sunnybrook. There is very close liaison.

Mr. ENFIELD: How are the doctors or other researchers appointed to this work?

Dr. WARNER: You mean to the research?

Mr. ENFIELD: I was thinking of research in particular.

Dr. WARNER: Well, somebody presently a doctor at Sunnybrook might get a brain wave and think he wants to carry out such and such a project. A chap overseeing part of the research at Sunnybrook might say, "I would like this done, where can I get a suitable man to take it on?" And he will talk to someone at the university and probably get him to do it (or maybe the university will ask us to do something), a professor of medicine or surgery will say, "I have got a bright fellow who wants to do this research", and send him to Sunnybrook and have him do the research there.

Mr. BROOKS: This $350,000—I take it that these men do not come under the Civil Service.

Dr. WARNER: A percentage.

Mr. BROOKS: Are they mostly doctors?

Dr. WARNER: High-priced technicians and doctors—nurses, dieticians.

Mr. MACE: I have a breakdown of the figures here. There are 39 medical officers, 42 clinical research assistants made up of those who work in the laboratory, a dietician, a psychologist and one medical social worker—in addition to 24 sundry classes of hospital nurses and nursing orderlies and a few stenographers.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is an item here in respect of special research drugs and special research equipment. I notice that in the case of special research drugs that for 1954—I am reading from the public accounts—the estimate was $10,000, but only $2,574 was actually spent in that year, and then the next year the estimate was $5,000 and for this year the estimate is $4,000. In the case of special research equipment there was an original estimate three years ago for $45,000 and less than half of that sum was spent, while for the year just ended the sum provided in the estimates was $35,000, and this year it is down to $7,000, to mention the round figure. I was just wondering as a matter of interest what was the explanation of that? Is it that this special equipment is now purchased and is available and that further expenditures are tapering off? I was wondering why the actual expenditure the year before last was so much less than the estimate?

Dr. WARNER: When a new drug comes out such as hormones or growth vitamin there is research on it paid from this vote and when this drug is established they do not pay for it. It is part of treatment. As far as equipment is concerned the equipment is getting built up so possibly we do not have to spend so much money. On the other hand someone may have a research project and there is some well qualified person to do it and then they find that the man goes to the United States or some place else and the project does not proceed with and they do not need the money.

Mr. MACLEAN: Generally speaking you have to estimate high because it is generally difficult to determine what the cost may be in advance?

Dr. WARNER: Yes. We had one of these super-ultra centrifuges put in Montreal at a cost of $25,000.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 515 "Hospital construction, Improvement, New Equipment and Acquisition of Land—$4,920,000".

Mr. BROOKS: May we have some idea where hospital construction is contemplated out of this vote?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: This would cover some work and construction to be done at St. John, Winnipeg and Vancouver. At St. John it is the completion of Westminster hospital and there is an item of $200,000 for the purchase and construction of the departmental laundry. In Winnipeg there is $1½ million replacement of a 300 bed hospital, Deer Lodge Hospital; it is the old wooden wing. At Calgary it is $1,080,000 for new wing facilities and that is going on now. It should be inaugurated this summer.

Mr. BROOKS: How many beds?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: 138 replacements and 87 additional in the new wing.

Mr. BLAIR: That amounts to how much per bed in a wing outside of any other services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Roughly $14,000 per bed but that includes re-setting of the whole services of the hospital.

Mr. BROOKS: How does that compare with the cost of a bed in a civilian hospital?

Dr. WARNER: I cannot answer that outright. The cost varies, as I understand it, between $12,000 and $30,000 depending on the facilities you have in hospital.

Mr. WESELAK: We equipped one which ran about $5,000 a bed for 25 beds.

Mr. ENFIELD: If I may speak about Sunnybrook there is certain land which it was constructed on from the Divadale estate. I am wondering what is the policy we are following in respect to the use of the Divadale estate. Are we ensuring that there will be sufficient land left there for extension of Sunnybrook's services?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The property at Sunnybrook was given by the Kilgour estate except for Divadale which was purchased. The Sunnybrook property was given by the Kilgour estate for the setting up of a hospital for veterans. The Divadale property was purchased by the department and is occupied as a health and occupational centre. There is considerable property; I cannot remember how many acres of unused land. Up until now the only other institution which has been permitted to go on that property has been the National Institute for the Blind. They are building a completely new centre in Toronto and they approached us and we sold to them the ground that they needed from part of the Divadale property which we had purchased and

they are building on it now. The reason which determined our making that sale to the Institute is the fact that we work very closely with the Institute for our blinded veterans and they had in mind that eventually on that property might be established other rehabilitation centres such as for the paraplegics and deaf and dumb, but none of the others have approached us as yet to get any of that property. Outside of that there have been no grants or sales made. Incidentally we sold the property to the National Institute of the Blind.

Mr. ENFIELD: Were you approached by the Ontario Society for Crippled Children at all?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We were approached. They were interested in acquiring some property but they have not filed with us any application as yet. Similarly I believe the hard of hearing are interested. They are studying a project themselves and so are the paraplegics but no definite application has been made by any of these groups to the department yet. Of course, as far as any of the property which was originally given by the Kilgour estate to the government is concerned if at any time it was considered that part of it should be disposed of permission would have to be obtained from the heirs of the Kilgour estate. Those were the terms under which we received the property that it was to be used for a veterans hospital.

Mr. ENFIELD: The Kilgour estate land represents the land the hospital is situated on separate from the Divadale estate?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. There is also on the Kilgour estate the York Health and Occupational Centre which is at the present time used by the armed services.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. BROOKS: Did you spend all of the $420,000 you had last year for construction and acquisition of equipment?

Mr. MACE: Do I understand that the question is about purchase of equipment?

Mr. BROOKS: The acquisition of equipment is $420,000 this year and $420,000 last year. I asked you if you spent all the $420,000 last year?

Mr. MACE: We spent more than $420,000.

Mr. BROOKS: What did you spend?

Mr. MACE: The 1954-55 forecast of expenditure for equipment is $570,000 for construction and acquisition of equipment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 516 "Prosthetic Services".

Mr. CHURCHILL: On this item I notice in the annual report, page 37, that motor units are being developed for wheel chairs. What progress is made along that line?

Mr. LALONDE: The director of prosthetic services is not here. He is more familiar with the development of that project. The director of prosthetic services in conjunction with the National Research Council has been working on the development of such a unit for over two years. They believe that they have found one which would be practical but it still has a few kinks in it. So far the report that I have is that it will be practical indoors but is not yet rugged enough to stand outdoor traffic. They are still working on it. The National Research Council are apparently very much satisfied with the progress they have made.

Mr. BROOKS: This perhaps does not come under this item, but we have heard a lot about the Callow coaches. I wonder if the department ever considered purchasing the Callow coaches. Did you ever consider a grant to the Walter Callow fund?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That has been considered. We are very familiar with the whole project. However, the department has never felt the need for the use of these buses. They are designed to transport in bulk wheelchair cases. We have some buses of our own and normally would not have need for these particular buses.

Mr. BROOKS: Except for that type of patient. You do not have any buses of your own that will handle wheelchair cases?

Mr. LALONDE: They will handle a few to go out for recreational purposes. We have found in our hospitals that the transportation which we have available enables us to take all the wheelchair cases we want to send to a hockey game for instance.

Mr. BROOKS: Would it take all who want to go?

Mr. LALONDE: So far we have not deprived any of them from attending these events.

Mr. BROOKS: That is very good.

Mr. ENFIELD: Could we find out how many persons are employed at the prosthetic services in Sunnybrook hospital. I understand it is one of the leading institutions of its kind. Could we see what are some of the services provided by this prosthetic services factory?

Mr. MACE: We have 23 office staff and 83 operating staff in the Sunnybrook factory, the operating staff being mainly orthopedic appliance makers.

Mr. ENFIELD: I understand that a lot of those would be veterans themselves?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Most of them, and amputees.

Mr. ENFIELD: The third part of my question there was if you could say what are some of the services provided by this particular institution?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The Sunnybrook factory manufacturers artificial limbs, splints, braces, body belts, orthopedic boots, boot modifications, artificial eyes, crutches, etc; purchases trusses, elastic hose, hearing aids, wheelchairs, stump socks, eyeglasses, etc.

Mr. ENFIELD: I just wanted to have the picture.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: For instance they have put out new gloves for patients; a few years ago we developed a new type of artificial leg there. It is very advanced.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On page 38 of the annual report there is a table showing the number of patients dealt with by the prosthetic services. I notice that certain serving personnel of the Department of National Defence applied for services. Other than getting glasses and lenses, what other services would they get from this section while still remain serving personnel of the Department of National Defence?

Mr. LALONDE: I believe that the bulk of the contribution made by the prosthetic services to the National Defence Department has to do with the supply of glasses.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: A member of the armed forces might be hospitalized in our hospital, and need a temporary appliance, let us say a leg brace or a body truss following an injury, and that would be provided by the prosthetic service; he would still be on the strength of the armed services.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What would be the prosthetic services provided to the Newfoundland provincial government? On page 38 it gives the value but it does not give any quantity of objects?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand this was under an agreement negotiated some years ago with the Newfoundland government where there seemed to be no facilities at all in Newfoundland for fittings of limbs and that type of work, so we do it for them and they reimburse us.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I notice for the manufacture of poppies there is a value of $232,574. Is that about the same from year to year, or does it vary?

Mr. LALONDE: It varies slightly. There was an increase last year. Of course they are all manufactured by the Vetcraft people for the Canadian Legion on a repayment basis.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The poppies which are manufactured during the course of the year are normally disposed of, and sold at the time of Remembrance Day. Are there any produced by Vetcraft and sold at any other time or for any other purpose?

Mr. LALONDE: No sir.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I suppose there would be no prohibition on the use of the poppy on other occasions. When we came down here at the beginning of this year, I ran into a few people in the halls of the parliament buildings who were engaged in interviewing members of parliament. I was interested to find that they were wearing in their lapels simulated poppies.

I examined those poppies closely and found that they differed a bit from the poppies which were produced for Remembrance Day. Am I right in that? They had three white dots on them.

Mr. LALONDE: That is right.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is not a poppy produced by Vetcraft?

Mr. LALONDE: No. We only sell the poppies through one organization and that is the Canadian Legion. One thing which has worried the Canadian Legion is that you cannot get a copyright on a poppy. There have been some poppies coming from other countries. The Legion has not been able to control it and the department has not been able to control it either.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are they placed on sale at any time? I have never seen them before. That is why I asked.

Mr. LALONDE: I never heard of them being sold on Remembrance Day, but I know there are some people who tried to muscle in on the Legion's activities in connection with poppies. There have been a few cases but I do not think that the Legion has any way of preventing it because there is no copyright on the manufacture of the poppy.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I understand that. It is a matter of public custom and observation. This was the first time I had ever seen a poppy of that nature or ever seen it worn other than on or about Remembrance Day. I naturally objected to its being worn on this occasion and I was told it was because these people were in favour of peace—which I happen to be in favour of too—and they thought that the poppy might therefore be used as an emblem to indicate that anyone who wore one was in favour of peace. I think it was a very objectionable use of the poppy.

Mr. BYRNE: I wonder why the Saskatchewan Red Cross is singled out for a special grant and not the other provinces, now that Newfoundland has been mentioned.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is done under an agreement which was entered into some years ago. We supply appliances to the provincial governments, to the Workmen's Compensation Board, that is, to the provincial Workmen's Compensation Board, appliances for cases which they have on their hands.

Mr. WESELAK: It is not a grant; it is recoverable.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right, it is not a grant, it is recoverable.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Carried.

Item 517 "Veterans' Bureau", $514,919.

Mr. BROOKS: This item does not change very much from year to year.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is mostly for salaries and some travelling expenses.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. BROOKS: On page 39 of the annual report you say:

> There are two main forms of procedure in the consideration of applications for entitlement to pension:
>
> For service in World War I, and in peacetime, application is by means of a First Hearing, Second Hearing and Appeal Board, with definite time limits for the various stages.
>
> For service in World War II, and in the Special Force, there are no time limits and procedure is by Initial Hearing, Renewal Hearing (unrestricted as to number) and Appeal Board.

Why is there a differential between World War I and World War II? I think I heard the reason at some time but I have forgotten it.

Mr. MELVILLE: The situation is this: For many years there was no statutory time limitation for World War I, until the year 1936 when parliament decreed that there should be a certain statutory time limitation and it evolved a new procedure.

That new procedure allowed the veteran to have a first hearing and then, within a certain time limit, a second hearing; and if he failed to establish his claim at the second hearing he had the right to request an appearance before an appeal board.

That procedure remained in effect in World War II until 1944, I think, and it was then realized that there would be a great number of men being demobilized who were being forced into the procedural stream and to a finality of their claims. It was inferred that there were latent conditions which had no opportunity to become manifest. Also there was such a tremendous pressure, as there would be under demobilization, to have all those claims processed rapidly, the Commission would have to set up enormous machinery to obviate all the trouble involved. So it was decided that the veteran might have what is called an initial decision, and when he got that initial decision, if unfavourable, he could come back and renew his claim. In fact, he could renew it as often as he liked. There is no limitation on the number of times for a World War II claim. He could then take his claim before an appeal board. That is the reason for the change. I dare say that the time will come when it will be desirable to have a uniform procedure for all claims, but at the present time that is the situation and the distinction.

Mr. BROOKS: This looks like a discrimination against the World War I veteran.

Mr. MELVILLE: The World War I veteran had no time limitation until 1936 when the first hearing, the second hearing, and the appeal board procedure was introduced. But as I mentioned two days ago before this committee, there is not a day when we do not receive applications from World War I veterans. They are still coming forward.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are the ones coming forward new cases, or people who have been up before?

Mr. MELVILLE: It is surprising with regard to World War I the great number of new cases, of men with increased disability which might have been rather slight and for which they would never have claimed a pension or were never awarded a pension. With advanced years the disability has become more serious. Not only that, but the cost of hospitalization means a greater burden, and he then applies to establish his claim. Many apply to the department for treatment, but having no pension entitlement, a ruling for treatment purposes is requested.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am not too clear with regard to some of this. I do not want to be placed in the position of being highly critical of the Pension Commission, but I am interested in just following through some of the work of the Veterans Bureau and of the Pension Commission, and it has to do with this type of thing. There is a first hearing, and a second hearing, and you can get leave to reopen for first war people. Do you not supply an appeal board if leave to reopen is granted?

Mr. MELVILLE: No. The World War I veteran is entitled to a first hearing, and a second hearing and he has the right to appear before an appeal board. If his claim before the appeal board is rejected, there is provision under section 65 (4) whereby he can apply for leave to reopen his claim on the basis that there was an error in the decision, or on account of evidence not having been submitted or otherwise. A man may secure new evidence and he applies for leave to reopen his claim. When such an application comes in from him or from the veterans bureau or from the Legion or from any other organization—perhaps from a private solicitor in some cases, on his behalf, I name a special appeal board, a new board entirely, of three commissioners who will hear that application for leave to reopen.

If they decide there was error in the decision of the appeal board, in conformity with the statutory requirements, on account of evidence not having been submitted or otherwise, they will grant the application.

If the application is granted it becomes a case de novo; and all which has happened in the past is forgotten. That man then has his first hearing and a decision is rendered on his claim. If the decision obtained is an unfavourable one, he can still go on to a second hearing, and can again go to an appeal board. That is the statutory procedure which is in effect.

Mr. POWER: Can that be done a third time? Can he have a third go over the road?

Mr. MELVILLE: If a man had gone before the appeal board?

Mr. POWER: And got two unfavourable decisions?

Mr. MELVILLE: A man could come back and apply for leave to reopen his case provided he meets the statutory requirements. There is nothing to hinder him.

Mr. BROOKS: He would have to obtain new evidence, would he not?

Mr. MELVILLE: That is right.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The thing which disturbs me is the problem of the First World War veterans. They are still entitled, as Brigadier Melville has said. Some new cases keep appearing at as late a date as this; but I just wonder: Are we ever going to reach an end with regard to the number of First World War veterans, or is there something in the Act or in the regulations which is preventing the Veterans Bureau or the Canadian Pension Commission from dealing with these people speedily.

Time is running out for them. I am a bit disturbed at the number of cases I see listed here which is occurring from people of the First World War, knowing that they seem to go through their first hearing, their second hearing, and end up at the appeal board. Some are allowed; some are partly allowed; and others go to the appeal board, granted in whole or in part and so on. There is not time now, because I see it is just about 5:30, but perhaps we could pursue this subject at our next meeting and get a full explanation of some of the difficulties which are confronting the Canadian Pension Commission and the Veterans Bureau.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is a later item in respect to the Canadian Pension Commission. Would you like to leave it until then?

Mr. CHURCHILL: If this fits in with it, and if you would permit me to mention it when we come to the Pension Bureau I would not mind.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think that would be agreeable to the committee. Shall item 517 carry?

Carried.

I think it is just about time for us to adjourn. Our practice has been to adjourn on time. The next meeting of this committee will be on Monday morning at 10:30 in this room.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 25

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Director of Finance and Stores; Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services, Treatment Services; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Mr. C. F. Black, Superintendent, Returned Soldiers and Veterans Insurance; Mr. F. J. G. Garneau, Chairman, War Veterans Allowance Board; and Mr. C. B. Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate, Veterans Bureau. And also Mr. T. J. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955

57606—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey-North*)
Blair
Brooks
Bryce
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Garland
Habel
Hanna
Hellyer
Lapointe
MacEachen
MacLean
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Weselak
Yuill

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, April 25, 1955.
(31)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett (*Grey North*), Blair, Brooks, Bryce, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Churchill, Dupuis, Enfield, Habel, Lapointe, MacEachen, MacLean, McLeod, Power (*St. John's West*), Tucker, Weselak, and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Veterans Affairs*: Mr. G. L. Lalonde, Acting Deputy Minister; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. E. J. Rider, Research Adviser; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Director of Finance and Stores; Dr. C. C. Misener, Director, Admission Services, Treatment Services; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director, Veterans' Welfare Service; Mr. C. F. Black, Superintendent, Returned Soldiers and Veterans Insurance; Mr. F. J. G. Garneau, Chairman, War Veterans Allowance Board; and Mr. C. B. Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate, Veterans Bureau and also Mr. T. J. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Veterans Affairs Department, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 518 to 525, inclusive, were adopted.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a.m. Tuesday, April 26.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

57606—1½

PROCEEDINGS

APRIL, 25, 1955.
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, I see a quorum. We are on item 518: "War Veterans Allowance Board—Administration—$144,450."

I have an explanation here from Col. Garneau and perhaps I should read it into the record. It is as follows:

> On reading over the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the meeting held by the Special Committee on Veterans Affairs, on March 21st, 1955, I note that two of my replies, as shown therein, warrant explanation or rectification.
>
> 1. The fist one, on page 89, is in relation to a question asked by Mr. Dinsdale, M.P., and concerns married recipients of War Veterans Allowance who are hospitalized for mental illness.
>
> My reply thereto is a detailed explanation of the administration of that part of section 14. (4) of the Act relating to inmates of any institution. However, the words "but not exceeding one year" should be deleted from the sentence which reads:—"More frequently it is $5 than $10 and it goes on as long as hospitalization continues but not exceeding one year", since payment of allowances with said deduction continues to be made to the veteran's family throughout the hospitalization period, providing, of course, their financial circumstances remain unchanged.
>
> The limit of "one year" applies only to that part of Section 14. (4) dealing with cases of recipients who are serving a term of imprisonment.
>
> 2. Further on, on page 112, when being called to reply to a question of Mr. White, M.P., regarding possible claims for recovery of overpayments from Veterans Estates, I realize that I have not made myself clear. What I meant to say was that the Board does not order recovery of a veteran's overpayment from any allowances which may be paid subsequently to his widow. In so far as the veteran's estate proper is concerned, the Department does recover overpayments when sufficient means are available. I believe, however, that consideration is given in such cases to the widow's situation, where no allowance is in payment, so that no hardship is caused as a result of such recovery.

Mr. BLAIR: Mr. Chairman, I have one question this morning; it concerns treatment, and is a simple question. What are the grounds for free treatment for recipients for War Veterans Allowances? I may say I have got a war veteran, completely crippled from arthritis and in receipt of allowance, who is having some trouble in getting his local doctor paid. I would like some clarification of how such men become eligible for free treatment as recipients of W.V.A. when they are disabled.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: A recipient of War Veterans Allowance is entitled to free treatment for any condition in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. BLAIR: Any condition?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

Mr. BLAIR: And is there any difficulty, particularly as to the type of treatment that is given by any local doctor? I am referring particularly to cases where there are differing methods of treatment, as there are in the case of arthritis; whether the department would pay a doctor bill where the treatment is open to argument, if the veteran is in the care of doctor approved by the department?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I will ask Dr. Misener who is in charge of Treatments Service to answer that question.

Dr. C. C. MISENER (*Director of Admission Services*): As well as receiving treatment for any condition in a veterans' hospital the recipient of War Veterans Allowance may receive treatment under the doctor of choice plan.

Mr. BLAIR: Outside the hospital?

Dr. MISENER: Outside the hospital, in his own locality. When he does, in general, there is no attempt whatever on the part of the department to dictate the type of treatment which is given. However, it can be said that the department does not wish to condone or to pay for anything less than the best treatment. Cases have arisen—very isolated indeed—in which it appeared that doctors of choice were giving medication—I am thinking particularly of pension cases—which did not seem to be necessary for the condition which they were treating. The question was sorted out in those instances through the medical profession itself. When the doctor of choice plan was set up it was arranged with the Canadian Medical Association that provincial associations would have small committees to advise in cases where the amount of bills, or the type of medicine prescribed, appeared to be unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

Mr. BLAIR: I just wanted to be clear that the department paid for treatment for these cases. This man was in trouble because the doctor complained that his bill had not been paid.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this item? Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 519: Veterans Insurance—$70,160.

Mr. BLAIR: I would like some information as to how popular this scheme is? How many veterans are taking out insurance under this Act?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I think I gave those figures the other day—the number of policies in force under both the Soldiers Insurance Act following World War I and the Veterans Insurance Act following World War II. That would appear in the record of the last meeting, I believe it was. However, I have the figures here and I will give them to you. Under the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act as of March 31st of this year there are 12,462 policies in force; under the Veterans Insurance Act as of February of this year there are 29,544 policies in force.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the veteran pays a part and the government pays another part?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, the veteran pays the whole premium.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Mr. BROOKS: I would like to know what the amount is in this insurance fund and whether it is actuarially sound from the point of view of insurance.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid I cannot give you that information because the Department of Finance is the department which looks after the fund and it is under the control of the Department of Finance. We underwrite the policies. We see that the veteran meets the qualifications required but the

handling of the fund itself is done by the Department of Finance. I can assure you, however, it is actuarially sound, although I have not the figures here. I might get Mr. Black, the superintendent of the insurance side of the department to explain the setup in more detail.

Mr. BROOKS: We pay all the expenses for this department?

Mr. C. F. BLACK *(Superintendent of the Veterans Insurance Act)*: That administration is a part of this department. There is no charge for administration in the fund. The fund is entirely separate and is handled now by the Department of Finance. As to the actuarial requirements, those are determined by the Department of Insurance at the end of each year. We submit a statement of the policies in force but they compute the actuarial reserve and make sure that the fund is adequate. I understand from them that it is actuarially sound.

Mr. BROOKS: I understand, of course, the Department of Finance looked after the finances. But I thought that the Veterans Affairs department would be sufficiently interested in this to know what the amounts were.

Mr. BLACK: We had a statement on the actuarial position of the fund a couple of years ago, and I understand that it was sound and I am told that since then it has remained that way. Our experience is that there is no reason to believe it should have deteriorated.

Mr. BROOKS: The claims are not as great today as they will be in 10, 15 or 20 years time.

Mr. BLACK: The claims do not decrease, but we are finding that there is a very steady ratio of claims, which is quite satisfactory.

Mr. BROOKS: The returned soldiers insurance is kept entirely separate from the veterans insurance?

Mr. BLACK: That is so.

Mr. BROOKS: And it has proven actuarially sound right through the peace?

Mr. BLACK: Not right through the peace. There was a period in the early and mid twenties when it was not sound, but that was overcome early in the twenties and since then it has been in good shape. We had a very early heavy debt paying experience in the early years.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we come to war veterans' allowance and other benefits.

Item 520: "War Veterans' Allowances and other Benefits—$29,736,000."

Mr. BROOKS: One other question I wish to ask on that. Under the Grants Act there are certain benefits which soldiers cannot receive if they are in the United States, but one which they can take advantage of is the veterans' insurance. I was going to ask if many war veterans living in the United States and in other places outside Canada have taken advantage of the provisions for veterans'insurance.

Mr. C. F. BLACK (*Superintendent, Returned Soldiers and Veterans Insurance, Department of Veterans Affairs*): We have issued to veterans living outside of Canada and also in the United Kingdom but they are mostly in the United States some 3,300 policies.

Mr. DUPUIS: Out of 29,000 policies?

Mr. BLACK: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: How does that compare in proportion to the veterans living in Canada?

Mr. BLACK: I suspect it is higher. We have issued something over 3 per cent in the proportion of veterans. We have something over 2,500 Americans in the States and I would say that would be something like 10 per cent. The ratio is higher because they can use their reestablishment credit for almost nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on this item?

Carried.

Item 521: "Assistance Fund (War Veterans Allowances)—$625,000."

Mr. BROOKS: Have you called war veterans allowances?

Mr. DUPUIS: We are still on the insurance.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to ask some questions, Mr. Brooks, on 520?

Mr. BROOKS: Yes. I would like to have a breakdown of the amount of $29,736,000, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean between the different forces?

Mr. BROOKS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That is on page 623.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The details are on page 623 and the services are shown in the middle of the page.

Mr. BROOKS: How many veterans are still receiving it from the Northwest Field Force?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As of February 1955 there were 21 in the Northwest Field Force. I might add that there are 52 widows who are drawing the allowance and who qualify by virtue of their husband's service in the Northwest Field Force so that the total number of recipients is 73; 21 veterans and 52 widows.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on that item now? It was carried before.

We are now back to 521: "Assistance Fund and the details are on page 623. I see that there are not very many details.

Mr. BYRNE: Might I ask just what is the origin of this assistance fund. Was it something that just accumulated during the war and is now being supplemented by the department?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: This was started in the fall of 1950 and the principal behind it was to have an assistance fund from which additional payments could be made to recipients of war veterans allowance who had no other source of income either through earnings or unearned income or who were incapable of working and for whom the allowance after a study was made of their case proved to be insufficient. The assistance fund was created and payments were made under that fund up to the permissible income ceiling. Under the Act, for instance, when the allowance was at $40 for a single man that allowance could be supplemented, if need was proven up, to $50 which was the income ceiling. The fund has been continued and the use of the fund has been broad. It still exists now and under the definition in the new order in council giving the conditions under which assistance can be given through the fund a greater expenditure than what appears here will be expended this year. A supplementary vote will have to be presented to cover the proposed expenditure during 1955-56.

Mr. BROOKS: How much was really expended last year, 1954-55? You have $450,000 here. I wondered whether that was all expended.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The latest figure is $512,000.

Mr. BROOKS: For last year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. It was over-expended.

Mr. BROOKS: How much more do you expect to require for this year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: $250,000.

Mr. BROOKS: Over and above the $625,000?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

Mr. BROOKS: What were the number of applications last year, the number proved and the number declined?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There were 3,194 new applicants to the end of January of whom 2,901 were assisted. The total number of recipients assisted under the fund was 5,288 as the 31st of January. The difference between that figure and the number of applicants assisted would be those who were continued from the previous year, a total of 2,387 carried over from the previous year.

Mr. BROOKS: They do not all receive the $10 each month? Do I take it some would be paid more and some less?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The average works out to about $85. The $85 was for ten months so it would be very close to $100 by the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. BROOKS: On page 19 of the report it gives the averages from 1950 to 1954 and the highest average there was $86.35 in 1952.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is higher now than it was in that year. That was for the year 1953-54. It will run to practically $100 this year.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 522: "Unemployment Assistance—$20,000." The details are on page 624.

Mr. BROOKS: May we have that item explained?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Parliament, would you mind giving the explanation?

Mr. G. H. PARLIAMENT (*Director General, Veterans Welfare Services, Department of Veterans Affairs*): The unemployment assistance fund was established originally by P. C. 43 of 10th January, 1921, to relieve municipalities of some of the costs of unemployment of disabled veterans and it was continued for the veterans of World War I including Imperial veterans. It is applicable to only World War I. It is the difference between the pension payment and the local municipal relief rate.

Mr. BROOKS: There are not very many demands on it?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Not many at the present time. Most of them are under war veterans allowance.

Mr. CHURCHILL: How does that differ from the assistance fund. Mr. Parliament said many of them are under war veterans allowance.

Mr. LALONDE: The assistance fund is for veterans who are recipients of war veterans allowance; but unemployment assistance is paid to a pensioner who is not a recipient of war veterans allowance or who is not eligible for the allowance and is in a non-insurable position and may need some help to carry on during a month or two of unemployment. He is able to work and through the use of that unemployment assistance we tide him over a short period after which he resumes his occupation and does not need any additional help.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does he have to be a pensioner?

Mr. LALONDE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 523: "Treatment and other Allowances—$2,782,500." The details are on page 624.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could we have some explanation as to what cases this applies to?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It applies to all pensioners being hospitalized. I would ask Dr. Misener to give the explanation to you.

Dr. MISENER: Treatment allowances are payable; I refer to treatment of pensioners for their pensionable condition, either as in-patients or under certain circumstances as out-patients. As out-patients, that is where the treatment is continuous, and the type of disability itself temporarily prevents him from taking substantial, gainful employment.

There is another rate of treatment allowance payable to another group; that is for veterans of the Korean force, and it is applied also to World War II veterans. When they receive treatment for conditions existing at the time of their discharge they are paid their service rate of pay and allowances.

There is another group which receives treatment allowances, and those are the veterans undergoing training under the Veterans Rehabilitation Act, and the veterans of the Korean force for any condition arising during the years subsequent.

The allowance also applies to ex-members of the regular forces for a condition existing at the time of their release from the regular forces. But that allowance is paid back to the Department of Veterans Affairs by the Department of National Defence.

Mr. BROOKS: In item 523 there is a reduction of $417,500, which is a decrease for the year 1955-56. What is the reason for that? Are there fewer war veterans allowance recipients, or is the hospitalization expected to be less this year?

Mr. LALONDE: No. It is the trend of the type of veteran being treated. I think there are perhaps less pensioners and more veterans who are not entitled to treatment allowances coming into the hospitals.

Mr. BROOKS: That would mean that there were fewer World War I veterans being treated, and more veterans from the second war?

Mr. LALONDE: No. We can give you the exact trend in the type of veteran being treated. The trend shows a slight decrease in the number of pensioners being treated, and pensioners of course represent the bulk of veterans who do receive treatment allowances.

The number of war veterans allowance cases has been at the same level. The domiciliary care and the recoverable sections have shown an increase, but in both cases these veterans are not entitled to the treatment allowances.

Mr. BROOKS: Do you expect fewer war veterans allowance veterans this year than last year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No. The recipients of war veterans allowance do not get the treatment allowance while they are being treated. So actually the decrease is reflected by the trend that there are less pensioners being hospitalized for their pensionable disabilities, who are the people entitled to the treatment allowance. There are more recipients of the war veterans allowance and more people under sections 13, 23, and 29.

Mr. BROOKS: Under the war veterans allowance, the pensioner gets full treatment, no matter what his disability is?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

Mr. BROOKS: The person who is receiving a disability pension is only treated for his pensionable disability?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Unless he qualifies under section 13.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

Carried.

Item 524: To provide for payments to the Last Post Fund; for the payment under regulations of funeral and cemetery charges, including the perpetual care of graves where applicable; for the cost and erection of headstones in Canada; for the maintenance of departmental cemeteries; for the maintenance of Canadian Battlefields Memorials in France and Belgium and for Canada's share of the expenditures of the Imperial War Graves Commission, $1,697,060. The details are to be found on page 624.

Mr. MCLEOD: In connection with the part which takes care of the cost of headstones in Canada, is it possible for anyone to get a headstone?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I gather that this is a qualified question.

Mr. MCLEOD: I do not mean while they are alive.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The veterans who are entitled to have headstones placed upon their graves are those who qualify for funeral and burial at the expense of the department. Then the department furnishes the headstone.

Mr. MCLEOD: I have been fighting a case all winter and I have come to the conclusion that it is almost impossible for a deceased veteran to have a marker on his grave.

Mr. MCLEOD: We have a case where a person was a little bit thrifty and was otherwise employed. He was a pensioner, and his family or his people, or the Workmens Compensation Board took care of the funeral. There seems to be no possibility whatever of a marker being provided for his grave. Yet, if that man had been absolutely destitute or indigent, and possibly not as good a type of citizen as this man was, he would have got all this free. It does not look to me to be quite fair.

Mr. LALONDE: Eligibility for the headstone has to be connected with eligibility for funeral and burial. While it is a matter of policy, I believe you will agree that the government cannot undertake to supply to all veterans the cost of their funerals, burials and headstones. The veterans who are eligible to recieve those benefits—if I may call them that—are those who died on treatment strength of the department, that is, while being treated in our institutions or at departmental expense. Veterans who are indigent and who die while they are not on treatment strength are looked after by the Last Post Fund, which is a separate body.

The pensioner who dies outside our hospitals as a result of his pensionable disability is entitled to a grant by the Canadian Pension Commission under certain financial conditions. It would appear that the policy is based, as for many of the other benefits, on the financial circumstances of the veteran; or the relationship between his death and the cause of his death. If we were to undertake to pay for the funeral and burial and headstones of all veterans who die of a disability or an illness which has no connection whatever with their service, you will realize what expense this would mean to the department.

Your case may well be one of those where the veteran does not fulfill any of those conditions. It is unfortunate that he did not qualify because he had earned his living and had been thrifty. But all veterans who are working and earning their living are exactly in the same position.

Mr. MCLEOD: There is a clause in the Act, Mr. Chairman. I believe it is section 25.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: In what Act?

Mr. LALONDE: May I ask to what you are referring?

Mr. MCLEOD: The Pension Act.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 25?

Mr. MCLEOD: There is a provision for compassionate grants. We are still pretty tight with them.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a different thing. That is the pension paid. Would you explain what section 25 provides, Brigadier Melville?

The CHAIRMAN: Could we not postpone that to when we get to the item, because it would make it easier to find it?

Mr. MCLEOD: I will discuss it privately with Brigadier Melville, if he is the person I should see about it.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. You should speak to the chairman of the pensions commission, Brigadier Melville.

Mr. MCLEOD: I shall be over to see him sometime soon, so we will let it stand.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: He will be very glad to see you.

Mr. BRYCE: I would like to ask the minister about the maintenance, of departmental cemeteries. Does that apply Beny-sur-Mer, and Dieppe? Do these cemeteries come under the Imperial War Graves Commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They come under the Imperial War Graves Commission and we pay to the Imperial War Graves Commission an annual payment based on the number of Canadian graves in those cemeteries.

Mr. LALONDE: The item to which you refer is that of maintenance of departmental cemeteries and the amount is $57,750.

Mr. BRYCE: I wanted to clear it up in my mind, whether it was for cemeteries such as we see in Canada or for those in France.

Mr. LALONDE: The department owns cemeteries in Canada at Saint John, Halifax, Kingston, and Esquimalt.

Mr. BRYCE: There is none in Winnipeg?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: People never die there?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes; there are a lot of old soldiers there.

Mr. LALONDE: In other districts we have plots in municipal cemeteries.

Mr. BROOKS: Do we pay for perpetual care for the plots in the different cemeteries?

Mr. LALONDE: We pay so much per grave.

Mr. BROOKS: In every cemetery where there are graves for soldiers?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a plot.

Mr. YUILL: I was wondering if there was any assistance provided for the burial of the wife of a burned-out pensioner?

Mr. LALONDE: There is no assistance provided for funerals and burials of dependents.

Mr. YUILL: Thank you.

Mr. BROOKS: What control do we have over the expenditures made by the Imperial War Graves Commission?

Hon Mr. LAPOINTE: They report to us each year. The commission sits in the United Kingdom, as you know. The Canadian representative on the Commission is the High Commissioner for Canada in London. They make an annual report to us, and to myself as agent for the Imperial War Graves Commission in Canada.

Mr. BROOKS: Do we audit their accounts?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. They give us detailed information of their yearly budget.

Mr. BRYCE: Might I ask the minister another question: has there been any consideration given by your department to doing away with the crosses and foot or ground stones? It would save money in the maintenance of the cemetery. They do such things in Honolulu, and they are talking about doing it in Britain too.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the poilcy. The crosses which were put in after World War II were of a temporary character and are all being replaced. In most cemeteries the replacement has been finished now, and regular headstones are replacing the crosses.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the explanation of the item for battlefield memorials?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is for the maintenance of the memorials which are maintained directly by the department. Those are Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel. The other Canadian memorials abroad are maintained for us by the Imperial War Graves Commission who we pay for the maintenance but Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel have always been maintained directly by the department.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What staff is in charge of that work?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a resident caretaker in Vimy. I will give you a breakdown, Mr. Churchill, of the $50,000 vote: salaries and wages, $7,760; maintenance expense of Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel, $12,000; maintenance expenses of other sites by the Imperial War Graves Commission, $19,325; repairs and upkeep of buildings and work, $6,000 and saundries, $5,000 or a total of $50,085.

As I mentioned, the only two which are maintained directly by us are Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel. In Vimy we have a resident caretaker who lives with his wife at the site of the monument, as you probably know, and there are nine or ten local people who are employed as gardeners or labourers. At Beaumont-Hamel we have a resident caretaker, and a locally employed labourer. The other monuments are all maintained by the Imperial War Graves Commission who we reimburse for the cost. I could give you the list of those, if you wish. In France there are: Monchy-le-Preux, Guedecourt, Bourlon Wood, Courcelette, Masnieres, Le Quesnel. In Belgium, there are: Hill 62, St. Julien, Paschendale, Courtrai.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the area surrounding the Vimy monument?

Hon Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it is about 80 acres and it extends a considerable distance behind the monument. There is sort of a forestry reserve on the ground, and it includes the trench system.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There was no appreciable damage done to that monument during the course of the war?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand there was none at all.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There were one or two little chips on it?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, nothing that could be attributed to enemy action.

The CHAIRMAN: It came over the air this morning that the designer of this beautiful monument passed away this morning.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Mr. Minister, is Beaumont-Hamel the cemetery taken over by your department?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it was a Newfoundland cemetery or memorial.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

525: "Grant to Canadian Legion—$9,000."

Mr. WESELAK: What is the particular purpose of this item?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It was originally given to help the Canadian Legion meet the expense of operating its service bureau. It was an accountable grant, originally in the amount of $10,000. This amount was reduced to $9,000 between 1930 and 1935, and it has been maintained at that figure, and was accountable each year. The amount of $9,000 was a maximum depending on the number of cases which were handled each year. The Legion gives us an account of its operation, and the maximum is reached every year.

Mr. DUPUIS: It is reached?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, every year.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Canadian Pension Commission

526: "Administration Expenses—$2,272,540."

The details are to be found on page 625.

Mr. BROOKS: The staff is practically the same as last year?

Mr. DUPUIS: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: At the close of our last meeting, we were dealing with the Veterans' Bureau, and I asked permission when we reached this item to refer back to that if necessary, and the chairman indicated that that might be all right. Some of the questions which I have to ask naturally overlap with the activities of the Veterans' Bureau, as you will understand. Although I fully appreciate the work of the Pension Commission and the Veterans' Bureau, nonetheless I have been wondering for a number of years about the apparent delay in dealing with the cases of veterans of the first war over the years. It is not something that has occurred just recently; this has been going on for 30 years. I wondered what the explanation is with regard to World War I personnel. Each year, year after year, a number of World War I veterans appear to make application to the Veterans' Bureau for pensions, and each year a certain number are granted, and each year an appreciable number are refused. The thing which seems to me to be rather odd is that over the years there appears to be almost a pattern of a number of applications being received and granted, and a number being refused. How do you account for the fact that World War I applicants for pensions have not reached a climax? Why did they not jump from 25,000 in 1918 to 150,000, let us say, by 1930, and then continue to decline? On the contrary, they appear to have risen from the early days up to about 80,000 in the middle thirties, and they are now declining, and are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60,000. Why do we not have a large number of applicants from World War I dealt with and decided upon, and then as the years go by the number would be only very small? That is something to which I would like to get an explanation, if there is an answer to that question.

Mr. J. L. MELVILLE (*Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission*): Mr. Chairman, I think there is one answer to Colonel Churchill's question which is very apparent. After World War I, a veteran was conceded a pension if he claimed for and established that he had a disability incurred or aggravated during his service. Throughout the years from World War I to World War II, and as a matter of fact up until today, we are still receiving applications for pensions from World War I veterans. When World War II came along, bearing in mind the history of what had happened after World War I, the commission established a very different procedure as follows: we examined the discharge

board of every man who served in World War II. If we considered he had a disability at the time of discharge we arranged and called him in for examination, and when we had completed the examination and the other necessary reports we gave a ruling.

When I was speaking at the close of the last meeting, I did state that we were getting applications every day from World War I veterans. Many of these are initial applications; they have never applied for pensions before. Quite frankly, some have incurred gunshot wounds which may have involved no loss of function and no essential degree of disability, at least nothing that could give rise to any concern on the part of the veterans, and only now are they making application. We have the same for other disabilities, but the commission with a great consciousness of the actual situation of World War I veterans has established a certain procedure in an endeavour to keep up to date with them. I will quote here from an instruction I issued two years ago:

> When a World War I pensioner is hospitalized, every advantage should be taken of the opportunity to re-examine him, in order to be sure he is compensated to the full extent of his pensionable disability. This should be borne in mind irrespective of whether hospitalization was for the pensionable disability or not.

And then we had another group of approximately 3,500 World War I pensioners who were in receipt of pension at 40 or 45 per cent. It was realized that when many of these men died and left dependents that the widows would make application and claim that had we examined these husbands before death their pensions would have been more than 40 or 45 per cent. Had it been 50 per cent or more they would have been pensioned irrespective of the cause of death. Members of the committee will remember—and Col. Brooks was a member of the committee then—that the special committee on veterans' affairs—I think it was in 1946—made a recommendation to the commission that all World War I pensions should be stabilized provided they had been in effect three years or more, without change. That action was taken. Consequently the commission was not called on to examine any of these men unless on application, but two years ago we initiated action and examined every pensioner whose award was 40 or 45 per cent and I am happy to report that as a result of that review a substantial number of awards were increased. We went further, and had in view another class of disability pensioner. We realized that many men were getting pensions for defective hearing—veterans of World War I—and we realized full well that in many instances there was a diminution in hearing—a lack of acuity, and that the men affected, throughout the years, probably had accommodated themselves to this increasing loss of hearing and did not think of making any claim. We had come across a few cases wherein on re-examination we had found a substantial increase in disability and bearing these in mind we decided to find out what the total number was with regard to this particular group. 6,100 World War I pensions are in effect for defective hearing—from 5 per cent to 80 per cent for total loss of hearing.

Mr. BROOKS: Would a veteran have to prove that a disability of loss of hearing was due to his service?

Mr. MELVILLE: The group I am dealing with all hold entitlement in respect of defective hearing. If I may finish dealing with that, I will go on to deal with your question.

Mr. BROOKS: The man who had no pension but who still lost his hearing could not get in a claim unless he could prove it was due to war services?

Mr. MELVILLE: He could claim. However, I will deal with that question in a moment. We decided to review all these World War I pensioners in respect of their defective hearing. They are being examined now, and again with the very result the commission envisaged. Many of these pensioners have increased disability and as a result their pension awards are being increased. With regard to the question which Colonel Brooks asked, the World War I veteran who considers that he has a disability arising from his service in World War I may claim for pension entitlement. There is a bar there, however, with respect to the man who had no service in a theatre of actual war, as the Act Sec. 15 provides that he may not be pensioned unless there is a record of a disability or unless application was made before the 1st of July, 1936. We endeavour to be very reasonable in that regard. We had an application on Friday from a World War I veteran who did not serve in a theatre of war and considered he had a disability. Actually he had a minor one assessed at 2 per cent at the time of discharge and the commission has ordered him in for medical examination and we shall determine whether he is entitled to anything more at the present time. Incidentally we had not heard from him since 1919.

Mr. BROOKS: Have you been paying him the 2 per cent rate all along?

Mr. MELVILLE: No. When the assessment is lower than 5 per cent the Act provides he shall receive a final payment not exceeding $160 and he got his payment.

Mr. BROOKS: In what year was that decided?

Mr. MELVILLE: That has been in the Act ever since 1919, when it was $100. In 1947 they increased the amount to $125, and in 1952, the 1st of January, it was increased to $160. What we have done, if we have found some of these old veterans pensioned under the old scale of $100, and disability still exists to the extent of maybe 2, 3 or 4 per cent, is this: we have given them an additional amount representing the difference between what they got in 1919, or whenever it was, and what they might get today under the increased rates.

Mr. WESELAK: That is an annual payment?

Mr. MELVILLE: As stated in the Act, it is a final payment.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Do I understand your system for dealing with people from World War II correctly—that it differs from that which was in force for a long time in respect to veterans of World War I and that consequently there is more likelihood of the people who make applications for benefits, or will be liable for pensions in respect of World War II being dealt with in a much shorter period than was required in the case of veterans from World War I? We have been dealing with World War I cases now ever since 1918, and I think we will continue to do so for another thirty years. Is this going to be the case with regard to World War II?

Mr. MELVILLE: I would say this: it was in 1940 that the number of pensioners from the first world war reached a peak—some 90,000-odd—the figure is given in the annual report...

Mr. CHURCHILL: It was 80,000 in 1940.

Mr. MELVILLE: I will get the actual figure. I think I am correct in saying that in 1940 the total number of disability pensioners reached its peak— I beg your pardon, the figure I gave included dependents. 80,133 disability and 98,310 disability and dependent pensioners.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I see. You are counting the dependents. I was just thinking about the disability pensioners.

Mr. MELVILLE: Veterans from World War I can still apply and the only restriction—and this is possibly what you have in mind—is this: a veteran from World War I who goes before an appeal board is required by the Act in

those circumstances to claim for any or all of the conditions attributable to his service, and having done so he cannot claim again. That finality was introduced by an amendment to the Pension Act of 1936.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Could we hear a word or two now with regard to the method by which the Pension Commission operates? Again with regard to World War I, do I understand that there is a first hearing, a second hearing and finally an appeal? The first hearing and the second hearing may be heard by three commissioners—am I correct?

Mr. MELVILLE: There must be two commissionners to render a decision on first or second hearing.

Mr. CHURCHILL: But when it comes to an appeal, the board consists of three commissioners.

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes. The appeal board consists of three commissioners none of whom has adjudicated on that particular claim at any time in the past, and if one of them happens to have done so he may only sit on the hearing of that claim by consent of the applicant.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is a sentence which occurs in the reports on page 39 in 1954, and it has been repeated in 1953 and 1951. It reads as follows:

"In all cases every effort is made to obtain final settlement without recourse to appeal board hearing."

I think, Mr. Chairman, that every effort is undoubtedly made, but I do not know of any efforts which fail of success in such a large measure as those in connection with first and second hearings because as far as I can discover from the reports the failure rate of combined first and second hearings is just about 91.2 per cent. That means that most of those disability applicants of the First World War have to have their cases decided by the appeal board. For example, I worked out the awards that had been made since 1950, dealing with the First World War in full or in part on the basis of first hearing and second hearing, and I found that according to the annual reports—and when I say 1950 I mean the year ending the 31st March, 1950—that taking the annual reports for the last five years, from 1950 to 1954, the total number of awards was 2,547. First hearings provided 241, and second hearings 218, a total of 459. Substracting that from 2,547 I get the figure of 2,088 awards which must, I presume, have been made by the appeal board. Let me interject this: because of this it is unlikely that First World War veterans will get an award on first application without going through hearings of one sort or another, whereas Second World War people may become pensionable without their cases being considered by the commission. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. MELVILLE: In an endeavour to help, Col. Churchill, and in appreciation of the question about which you spoke at the close of the last meeting, I have procured these figures. May I make this clear: when a pensioner or a World War I veteran goes into hospital and receives treatment for a certain condition, the department, or someone else on behalf of the applicant, will ask the commission whether or not that particular condition has arisen in relationship to the man's military service. That action may be initiated without any action whatever being taken on the part of the veteran himself. Then we have another very large group: a World War I veteran dies and the commission is called upon to give a ruling with respect to his death because there may be a policy under the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act. The question may arise as to burial and so on. We are called on to render these decisions in many circumstances.

To clear up the situation which bothers Col. Churchill I have here the actual figures for the year ending the 31st of March of this year in respect to last year's work and if I deal with them members of the committee will see

exactly what happened. In the fiscal year ended the 31st of March the commission dealt with 3,873 World War I applications. All of these had naturally to be subject to a first hearing because that is the statutory procedure.

Mr. CHURCHILL: These are new applications?

Mr. MELVILLE: First applications to the commission. Of those we granted 490 at the first hearing, and 3,383 were rejected. When these decisions were rendered the commission advised the applicant. The applicant may have been a veteran or may have been a widow. The commission advised them as to the reasons for the decision and of the rights they had under the Act to reapply. It is significant that of 3383 which were not granted only 472 came back to the commission on second hearing. Of that 472 who came back on second hearing, 39 were granted and 433 were not granted. The 433 who were not granted were advised that under the statute they had the right to request an appearance before an appeal board. Each one was advised very fully that the facilities of the Veterans' Bureau were available or a national organization of ex-servicemen or that they might select their own advocate. Of that 433 who were not granted at second hearing, 301 appeared before an appeal board of the commission. Of the 301 who appeared, 96 were granted and 205 were not granted. All of these were World War I claimants.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is very interesting information. Where you mention that 490 applications were granted last year that is a much higher total than appears in any of the other 5 reports which I have looked at.

Mr. MELVILLE: I would doubt that. I will check up over the last 5 years and see. The annual report deals with the decisions rendered by appeal boards.

Mr. CHURCHILL: May I say that the annual report makes a clear distinction between World War I and World War II at the first hearing and second hearing but when you put down the figures for the appeal board they are lumped together and no distinction is made between first and second world wars and it is difficult to estimate what the appeal board has been dealing with.

Mr. MELVILLE: I think this may be the answer: are you looking at page 39 of last year's annual report?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, I will.

Mr. MELVILLE: You are dealing with applications received and submitted to the Canadian Pension Commission.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Averaged through all those headings.

Mr. MELVILLE: These are applications submitted by the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes.

Mr. MELVILLE: I endeavoured to point out that applications reach the commission from a number of sources: first the Veterans' Bureau, second the national organizations of ex-servicemen, third the veteran's own advocate whom he may appoint, or fourth, the veteran may apply directly, or the department in many cases will refer the case directly to the local pension medical examiner to ask if this man has any entitlement and if so will he submit a claim to the Pension Commission at Ottawa. Again, would you refer to page 74 of this same report. It deals with World War I decisions rendered by the commission, and you will see at first hearing we granted 532, rejected 3,508 out of a total of 4,040. The situation is fairly even over the past few years and in the same way you have decisions rendered on second hearing and by an appeal board. That is for the previous fiscal year.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is much greater than you have on pages 39 and 40.

Mr. MELVILLE: That is the report of the Veterans' Bureau and not the commission, the claims they deal with.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is why I thought I had to refer to the Veterans' Bureau in addition to get the picture clear. On page 40 it says "Allowed By The Canadian Pension Commission on first hearing 41 and on second hearing 18" and yet if you turn back to page 39 they had 239 first hearing and on second hearing accepted 1,026. When you refer me to page 74 that must mean that over and above the large number reported by the Veterans' Bureau there were other applications made by other organizations?

Mr. MELVILLE: That is correct, a great number. All claims do not go through the Veterans' Bureau. Brigadier Topp is here, the Chief Pensions Advocate.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Then again on page 40 when the appeal board hearings are listed I see they are all grouped together and there is no distinction between World War I and World War II and a person cannot really follow it through as to how many of the applications end up at the appeal board.

Mr. MELVILLE: Would you like the figures for the fiscal year from the results of the appeal board for World War I and World War II?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes.

Mr. MELVILLE: If you look at the figures for World War II there were 1,380 claims before the commission, these are appeal board claims. Of the 1,380; 710 were granted and 515 were disallowed. Struck off; because the applicant did not appear or withdrew his claim in 35; and 16 were incomplete. Incomplete would be where the case was adjourned in order to obtain post-hearing evidence in support of the applicant's claim. Completed or awaiting decision, 4, and that probably is because one or another of my colleagues was absent from the city at the time they were completed. That gives a total for World War II of 1,380.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You say that 710 were granted. That is by the appeal board and World War II applicants?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: And yet they have the opportunity of initial hearing, first renewal, second renewal, third renewal, further renewal and the appeal?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes, although the Act provides that the commission in the World War II claim will render an initial decision. The applicant is then advised he may renew his claim with additional evidence or may request an appearance before an appeal board. It is surprising the number of men who go direct from initial hearing to the appeal board. Quite frankly the commission advises them that if they have new evidence to submit for renewal consideration. If the evidence is substantial enough and warrants it we will grant the claim and we would rather do it without the necessity of going to the appeal board. That is the reason for the comment in the annual report. That is our constant endeavour, to clear it up without going to appeal.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In the tabulation of figures by the Veterans' Bureau it did not clear that up. Your explanation indicates perhaps that situation is much better. The thing which struck me as a bit odd is, going back to World War I people, first hearing, second hearing, appeal board, I can understand the decision not being reached at first hearing in some instances, but why not at second hearing? Going to the appeal board sounds as if it is something remarkably different from first or second hearing, but actually the men who sit on the appeal board are men who perhaps the day before were doing the same thing on first or second hearings. Is the procedure different before the appeal board than on first or second hearings?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes. The commission at the present moment consists of 13 commissioners including a chairman, a deputy chairman and from the 11 commissioners appeal boards are constituted and each appeal board consists of 3 commissioners. One very important factor which results in favourable

decisions of the appeal board is the creditability of the witness. You know very well that with respect to many of these claims there may be little or nothing on the record. I am talking about overseas documents. The applicant submits certain statements or statements of witnesses and when that comes before the commission, say on first hearing, and we do not grant his claim we advise him he may go to a second hearing. He gets some more evidence and before he goes to an appeal board he has probably considerable evidence supported by medical opinion, and the creditability of the witness and medical opinion then plays a very great part in the decision reached by the appeal board. Mr. Chairman, may I say for information of the members of the committee that when an applicant goes before an appeal board he may bring with him witnesses in support of his claim and the applicant is allowed his first class transportation expenses or, if he wishes, his own transportation at 4 cents a mile; he also gets meals in transit at $1.50 a day, allowance for meals while detained of $1 per meal and lodging allowance of $3 and loss of wages of $7.50 a day. He may have medical witnesses appearing on his behalf and these witnesses are entitled to certain fees. The fee for a general practitioner is at one rate and the fee for a specialist is at a higher rate. These are all paid by the Commission.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The return transportation is paid?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Anywhere in Canada.

Mr. MELVILLE: No. It is usually governed by the appeal board sitting in the most favourable place to the applicant.

Mr. BROOKS: We have a great many instances from the first war where a man may know of someone who served with him in the trenches who may live in Vancouver and the applicant lives in Nova Scotia. Will he get transportation for the man to travel from Vancouver to Nova Scotia?

Mr. MELVILLE: No. The applicant for pension submits a statutory declaration from that person who served with him in support of his application.

Mr. BROOKS: I was doing a little bit of arithmetic. Out of 2,070 first war applications, 625 pensions were granted and out of 1,380 in the second war, 765 were granted or over 50 per cent. It is less than 20 per cent, I think, in the first war. I know there is a good reason for this but I wonder if the commissioner would give us the particular reason for this great difference. It did occur to me that perhaps because of the difficulty of getting evidence scattered all over the country for the first war veteran and the fact that a great many of his comrades were dead he could not supply the evidence which a second world war veteran could.

Mr. MELVILLE: The figures I quoted for World War I deal with all applications for World War I veterans received by the commission and I said that a great bulk of these were from men who are undergoing treatment in hospital. A number also are in connection with deaths. They are not direct applications but they are cases in which the commission is called upon to act and render decisions for administrative purposes. Whereas in the case of World War II they are in the main applications from the member of the forces himself. Does that answer your question?

Mr. BROOKS: Yes.

Mr. MELVILLE: I hope so. I want to give all the information I can.

Mr. BROOKS: I know you do.

Mr. WESELAK: You said there was 1,380 appeal board claims in connection with second war veterans; in the same period of time what initial applications did you have? How many initial applications would you have arising during that period?

Mr. MELVILLE: We had 4,590 initial applications before the commission.

Mr. BROOKS: Could you give us a breakdown of them, the same as you did of the first?

Mr. MELVILLE: All right, I will do that. This is for the fiscal year ending 31 March, 1955:

For World War II the commission received 4,590 initial applications. Of those 4,590, 2,105 were granted; 2,485 were not granted. Those which proceeded to renewal,—I will not break them down as to first, second, and third hearings—there were 3,579 applications; and of that total 1,558 were granted and 2,021 were not granted.

The CHAIRMAN: Just to finish that, you gave us a figure in regard to World War I in regard to those not granted, but which went to appeal board. Could you give us the same figure with respect to World War II?

Mr. MELVILLE: I did. The total of those which went to appeal board in World War II was 1,380. Of that number 710 were granted and 515 were not granted; and the balance of 55 is pending.

Mr. BROOKS: In World War I there were 301.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. BROOKS: 301 were appealed; 96 were granted; and in World War II 1,380 were appealed and 720 were granted. My question was this: what is the reason for the great discrepancy between World War I and World War II?

Mr. MELVILLE: I think that a very good reason probably is that it is nearly 40 years since these members of the forces were discharged. The average age of World War I veterans today is 65-66. Many of the claims which reach the commission are unfortunately claims for conditions which just plague some of us who are getting into our advancing years. There has been nothing recorded at the time of discharge from service and there is nothing recorded in the intervening period. I see such claims every day. There was nothing until the condition arose around 1953, 1954 and 1955; and without that connecting link, it is practically impossible for the commission to concede that the disability was incurred during service; or that death was related to some condition incurred during service in World War I.

Mr. BROOKS: It is much more difficult for a World War I veteran to get his evidence than it is for a World War II veteran. Would it be fair to say that?

Mr. MELVILLE: Not entirely; but I will admit that through the representations made to the three services; the documentation in World War II is better than it was in World War I. It is remarkable how excellent the records are. The war service records for World Wars I and II have been collected and maintained in Ottawa and are in marvelous order and are very, very complete.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to say to the brigadier that when you study the figures in regard to World War I, they were able to grant 490 on first hearing, and 79 on second hearing. Those would be cases justified by documents. 301 asked for an appeal board hearing. Out of them they were able to grant 96 which apparently were not justified entirely by documents, but rather by evidence which they were able to bring forward—I fancy in most cases by the veteran himself—establishing that his disability arose during service.

It indicates that they were able to grant one-third of the actual applications which were not really justified by documents alone, which shows that our pension commission is giving sympathetic consideration to applications

from older veterans of World War I. As far as I am personally concerned, I would like to say that I do appreciate the attitude taken by the Pension Commission towards those old comrades of World War I.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think there is any difference of feeling on the part of the members of the committee in regard to that statement of yours, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought that I should say it because it might be felt there was some criticism and I am sure that is not the intention.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I mentioned the same thing the other day, that to investigate the normal functioning of the veterans bureau and the Canadian Pension Commission might, on the face of it, imply some serious criticism of the commission; but that is not in my mind. I am anxious to get information as to how it functions and my hope is that the second world war veterans won't have to go through all the years of their lives awaiting returns—if I may use that expression—in the way that the first world war veterans have. Hence the questions I have been asking.

May I say that I seem to have been thrown out a bit on the figures which I originally put before the committee. I was looking at page 74 and the summary of the Canadian Pension Commission's decisions on applications. Comparing that with the tables on pages 39 and 40, it shows a changing picture; on page 74 the number of death claims is 3,446, whereas the Veterans Bureau people report only 567; consequently that creates an entirely different picture.

My understanding of the report of the Veterans Bureau was that 567 applications were brought forward by the men themselves making application for consideration of their cases; and hence my small figure here taken from the report as to applications granted on first and second hearings.

I still think that they were not as concerned with applications arising upon the death of the veteran, whereas from this table on page 74 I would judge that the larger number granted on the first hearing, 532, might very well be largely a question of death claims.

Mr. MELVILLE: Let me explain that a little bit. Those 3,446 death claims that you speak of in a great many cases arose from deaths in hospital. If death was attributable to a pensionable disability, the commission would so rule, and the dependants would be pensioned. If pension was in payment at 50 per cent or more at the time of death the commission would render a decision, and that decision would entitle the widow and children to pension.

On the other hand, we have other cases. I did mention the large group of men who die in or out of hospital, World War I veterans. Many were holding returned soldiers insurance policies, and the commission is called upon to rule regarding death. Those claims do not proceed any further. Of those which do a large proportion would go through the Veterans Bureau; and those are the ones you find in the report of the Chief Pension Advocate.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, no.

Mr. MACLEAN: The figures which Brigadier Melville gave us regarding first hearing, second hearing, and the number of cases which go through to the appeal board cause this question to arise in my mind: a large proportion fall more into Brigadier Topp's field, and my question is this—from my own experience I have the feeling that a lot of veterans who have rather doubtful claims for pension get the impression—or the impression gets around among them—that if they are sufficiently persistent, they may meet with success in the end. I hope that is not the case, but I would like some clarification of it.

In the case of World War I veterans, I think that the figures which were given us showed that there were 3,783 who applied for pensions, and that 490

were granted in the first case. I have no quarrel with that whatsoever; but then, of the 3,383 which were turned down, 472 went to second hearing.

What I am concerned with is those 472. Were those 472 the ones with the best cases out of the 3,383, or were they the most persistent fellows?

There is a tendency among some fellows to feel even if they are turned down the first time that they must have had a case to start with or they would not have applied; and the people who are turned down seem to fall into a broad field. Do we know how many who feel this way about it: "I won't have anything more to do with them". They do not want to appeal. They have a feeling that they have been snubbed, as it were. On the other hand, you have the persistent fellows who hang on with a death-like grip to the merest hope.

I would like to know if someone can give us an idea of who these 472 were who went on to a second hearing, and of which eventually 301 went on to appeal? If they are the ones with the best cases, then it is fair enough that 96 should have favourable hearings in the end, and that the pension should be awarded. But if they were the 301 most persistent fellows, it seems to me that it is a very high rate of success once you get to the appeal board.

I do not want to imply that there is any unfairness about it, but on the other hand it must create a very great problem for the pension advocates in the field to make sure that the fellows who have likely claims to persist until they go right through to the appeal board if necessary. I was just wondering if the brigadier would like to comment on that problem?

Mr. MELVILLE: May I make this very definite statement at the outset. The job of the Canadian Pension Commission is to award pensions, not to deny them. That principle has been laid down, and that practice is followed. The Act also says that before rendering a decision the Commission shall pursue all inquiries and we make it our business to write a man and say, "Well now, here is a casual statement, or one without any supporting evidence that this or that was incurred. Have you any supporting evidence because we would like to have it before we give our first decision?"

The honourable members of this committee know very well the type of cases they receive, and their correspondence with the Commission. I thoroughly enjoy my correspondence, because I get from the members what probably amounts to a different slant on applications for pensions from that which I receive from other sources. I give them my personal attention, and enjoy them, and endeavour to give you the full facts and information with regard to the claims. This is the attitude of the commission and the Veterans' Bureau in their capacity. To advise and help a man when filing a claim for a pension. There was a time when the Veterans' Bureau submitted a claim for pension and a commission counsel acted as sort of Crown attorney. Well, counsel was abolished years ago, and therefore when a claim for pension comes forward there is only the applicant and those acting on his behalf. When you speak of that group, Mr. MacLean, the 472 who go on, I think the reason there are so few is because many of the decisions we rendered were routine. Routine is not the word I mean, because we do not render routine decisions, but they were formal or administrative decisions which the commission was called upon to render. In every one of the 3,383 cases that were not granted, the commission sent out the same notification which said in effect, "the commission has ruled that on the evidence available your claim for so and so could not be granted. You are advised that in accordance with the Pension Act, you have the right to proceed further with your claim, and you can request a second hearing and you have 60 days in which to lodge your application." Many do not do it within the 60 days, and we sometimes grant an extension of time, and let him go ahead. Then we go on in our letter to say, "We advise you that the services

of the Veterans' Bureau are available to you without charge," and on the back of our letter we show a list of the district pension advocates and the various offices throughout Canada. We also mention the organizations of ex-servicemen and the fact that the applicant may engage a solicitor at his own expense.

Mr. BROOKS: In many of these cases, it must be perfectly obvious to you and to the commission that the veteran does not have a chance in the world of succeeding in his claim. Do you send them the same letter alvising them to see the Bureau, and the pensions' advocate and so on?

Mr. MELVILLE: We do indeed, Colonel Brooks. Recently one dear old lady whose husband, a non-pensioner, died at the age of 97, wrote in and claimed that his death was due to World War I service, and she was sent the same kind of courteous letter that the others receive.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was not complaining about the number who went up for a second hearing, nor do I submit that it is too small, or anything of that sort. As a matter of fact, to my way of thinking, the smaller the number is, the better, because that would give an indication to begin with that the first hearing was complete, and secondly that everyone was satisfied with the decision arrived at. What I was concerned with was to ascertain whether or not these 472 are the right people, if I might put it in those terms. There are people who if they get an unfavourable decision in the first go, might become discouraged right off the bat, and if the application fails, and they feel they should have gotten it, they might not want anything more to do with it. I would like to feel that those people who have a reasonably good or a borderline case would be encouraged in every way to persist in going to the pensions' advocate, or some other advisor.

Mr. MELVILLE: That is exactly so, they are, and the commission gives reasons for its decision. I think that is another important factor. We give the reasons leading up to our decision. If a veteran does not accept the reasons for the decision, he may advance or appeal the claim.

Mr. BLAIR: Some cases are not prepared when the original application is made, and the applicants come back with more data, and have their case better prepared, and that would account for your group, Mr. MacLean.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I can understand the first hearing where people have to go back and get further evidence, and so on, but on second hearing 39 cases were granted, and 96 were refused but were subsequently granted by the appeal board. It appears strange to me because it is virtually the same men who are sitting on these cases. That is, they are men of the 13 commissioners who are constantly reviewing cases, and they have similar experiences. Why on a second hearing would three of the commissioners reject 96 applicants, which three other commissioners accepted on appeal?

Mr. MELVILLE: There is an answer to that, Colonel Churchill. The chief pensions advocate who, shall I say, is sitting on the other side of the fence works closely with us and we have wonderful co-operation from him. On going to second hearing, many men submit no new evidence. They simply re-submit their claim for second hearing and want to go to appeal. Before they go to appeal they have then formed a much more intimate connection, shall I say, with the Veterans' Bureau and appear with their witnesses. The credibility of the witness, and the evidence advanced on his behalf at that time, is very important. All these very important factors have a great bearing.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Why should they want to go to appeal? If I were applying for a pension, after examining these figures, I would certainly want to go to appeal, because I would recognize that on first and second hearings, going

through the Veterans Bureau and accepting their figures, that my chances of getting accepted are just about one to 12, whereas if I go before the appeal board, in so far as I can figure it, they grant about 43 per cent of the cases that come before them. Why has the impression got abroad that it is better to go to the appeal board? Appeals must consume quite a bit of time and involve a good deal of expense? Think of the delay.

Mr. MELVILLE: I would like to speak regarding delay. There is no delay. Every case listed with the commission now is slated for hearing before the end of June. We have no delay in so far as appeals are concerned.

Mr. BROOKS: On page 40 of the report of the Department of Veterans Affairs, under the heading of claims allowed by the Canadian Pension Commission, there is a long list. The last item is retroactivation, and it states that there were 59 retroactive payments, I take it out of all those paid. What is the policy with reference to the payment of these pensions?

Mr. MELVILLE: The Pension Act Sec. 31 provides that when an application for pension is granted, the award shall be effective from the date of application, or if the date is in excess of one year, it may be retroactive for a period of 12 months from the date our decision is rendered. We have a number of applicants who say, "I had this condition for so many years, and I consider my claim should go back further". When an application comes in for an additional retroactive award, the statute makes provision whereby an additional six months may be granted in cases of hardship and distress. When such an application is received we make an inquiry, or if it is done through the Veterans' Bureau, they make a full inquiry, and submit the claim for an additional award under subsection 2 of the Act. They may go still further, as there is provision in the act whereby an additional period not exceeding 18 months may be granted providing the delay resulted from administrative and other causes beyond the applicant's control. We do not have many of those claims now, but we did have some in the post-war II period, where documentation had not reached the director of war service records in Canada. There are cases where there may be, for some just cause, an administrative or other delay beyond the applicant's control, and we may grant an additional period not exceeding eighteen months. Therefore, the maximum retroactive award a disability pensioner may get is the 12 months provided by the statute if the application was beyond the 12-month limit. Six months may be granted, in cases of hardship and distress, and an additional 18 months in cases involving administrative or other delay beyond the applicant's control. In addition to that, there is provision in the regulations of the department whereby payment for medical and hospital expenses may be given for a further period if the pensionable disability actually existed over that time and the veteran had incurred expenses.

Mr. BROOKS: I have a case where a man made his first application, he says, in 1946, and he obtained his award about six months ago. His contention is that he is receiving a pension which was made retroactive for six months only, from the date of the grant. I was wondering why there was sort of a discrepancy in that particular case?

Mr. MELVILLE: There might be no discrepancy. The decision may have been rendered in 1946, and it might be that he did not pursue his claim until 1954 or 1955. I mean, if he sleeps on his rights and does nothing about his claim, we do not consider that there are administative or other delays beyond the applicant's control. The statute provides very clearly what we can do,

and if he does not take advantage of it then we are not in a position to grant any further retroactive award. However, I will be glad to look into the case if you care to submit it.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, no, Mr. Chairman. I have some other questions, but it is 12.30.

The CHAIRMAN: We will not be able to meet this afternoon, and we cannot meet on Thursday, so we will meet twice tomorrow at 10.30 a.m., and at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 26

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. C. B. Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate, and Mr. E. V. Wilson, Legal Advisor, both of the Veterans' Bureau; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

57608—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey North*)
Blair
Brooks
Bryce
Byrne
Cameron (*Nanaimo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Garland
Habel
Hanna
Hellyer
Lapointe
MacEachen
MacLean
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Weselak
Yuill

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.
(32)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett (*Grey North*), Blair, Brooks, Bryce, Byrne, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Churchill, Enfield, Garland, Habel, Hellyer, Lapointe, MacLean, Macnaughton, McLeod, Robichaud, Tucker, Weselak, and Yuill.

In attendance: *From the Department of Veterans Affairs*: Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. C. B. Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate, Veterans' Bureau; and Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman.

Mr. Melville supplied tables showing the number of Disability Pension Applications received and the number of hearings and appeals dealt with in recent years.

Agreed: That the above-mentioned tables be printed.

(*See Appendix "E" to this day's Evidence*)

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

(33)

The Special Committee on Estimates resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett (*Grey North*), Blair, Brooks, Bryce, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Cannon, Churchill, Enfield, Habel, Hanna, Hellyer, Lapointe, MacLean, Macnaughton, McLeod, Power (*St. John's West*), Robichaud, Tucker, Weselak, and Yuill.

In attendance: Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission. *From the Department of Veterans Affairs*: Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. C. B. Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate, and Mr. E. V. Wilson, Legal Adviser, both of the Veterans' Bureau; Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director General, Veterans' Welfare Services; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Mr. A. D. McCracken, Senior Administrative Officer, Mr. H. C. Griffith, Superintendent of Construction, and Mr. W. Strojich, Superintendent of Property, all of the Directorate of Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

57608—1½

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Veterans Affairs Department, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 526, 527, 528, were adopted.

The Chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission was thanked and he retired.

Mr. Rutherford was called and he presented a precis of the operations of the Directorate of Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

At 5.25 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Wednesday, April 27.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

APRIL 26, 1955.
10.35 A.M.

The CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Tucker*): Order gentlemen we are still on item 526: "Administration Expenses, Canadian Pensions Commission". Brigadier Melville has prepared an analysis of the work of the commission with regard to the matters which Mr. Churchill was speaking of yesterday, and I will ask him to deal with this now.

Mr. J. L. MELVILLE (*Canadian Pension Commission*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. We were dealing with the claims in respect of World War I and the number granted. Mr. Churchill was anxious to know if figures were available over the past five years, and I have a statement here with regard to disability pension applications showing the numbers received for each of the last five fiscal years up to the 31st of March of this year. I also have the corresponding figures dealing with decisions rendered on second hearings or renewals and an analysis of the decisions rendered by appeal boards over the same period. The figures relating to the appeal boards are broken down into sections dealing with claims arising from World War I and from World War II, the permanent forces —which are the peacetime forces—and the special force which was for service in Korea, and I trust that the figures will be found complete and of interest.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that this table should go into the record as an appendix?

Agreed.

(See Appendix "E")

The CHAIRMAN: If you wish to see this, Mr. Churchill, in order to ask any questions about it, you may take a look at Mr. Melville's copy. Perhaps there may be some other questions which members of the committee would like to ask while Mr. Churchill is checking those figures over?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I will check the figures later. I have some other questions, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering about the number remaining with regard to veterans of World War I, and I have been endeavouring by looking over the report to find out how many veterans had appeared before the pension commission since the First World War, how many awards had been made and how many refusals had been given. I may say at this point for the information of the minister that the earlier reports, I think, were better than the one I have in my hand now for March 31, 1954. The tables used to occupy about 36 pages, according to my recollection, but they are now cut down to something like 16 pages and the result is that there is not as full information in the 1954 report as there was in the preceding ones, and that makes it difficult to make a comparison or to follow a train of thought. However, in some of the other reports I did get some of this information and I was wondering whether any is available now—the total number of awards made from 1918 to the present time and the total number of recipients. As far as I can figure out the total number of awards is something more than 80,000. It must be more than 80,000 because the peak of people receiving pensions, I think in 1940, was 80,000. Refusals amount to around 116,000. These figures do not include the last five years because I have no figures available to cover that period, but in general terms something

like 200,000 men of the First World War have made application and have either been granted awards or been refused. How great is the problem at the present time? Most of the pensioners are people who served in France. The number awarded pensions for service in Canada and in England is rather small. Of those who served in France—it is generally accepted that 400,000 men got into that theatre—60,000 were killed and 340,000 survived, and of that number it is generally accepted that 120,000 were wounded, but apparently not all the people who were wounded have received pensions. I do not know how many have died since 1918, but the survivors are dying off at the rate of 2,000 or 3,000 a year—certainly the rate of 2,000 a year applies to pensioners. I do not know about those who are not on the pension rolls. But I do think that most of the men who suffered from injury or wounds or disease in the First World War have at one time or another made appearances before the pension commission or, I should say, made applications for consideration by that commission. That is why I wonder that there are appearing at the present time, according to the statement we have had here, new applicants who have never been heard of before. Might it not be that those who have been refused in the past—refused, maybe in 1927 or in 1935—are taking another chance at it at the present time? I would be interested in having the figures of the total number of awards from 1918 to the present day, the total number of refusals and some explanation of the number who still remain to be dealt with in so far as the men of the first world war are concerned. Is any of that information available now?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes, I would be very glad to get that information for you, Mr. Churchill. Perhaps in answer to your question I may be allowed to give an illustration of what happens in the board room when these applications are heard. I was in the board room for about an hour last night dealing with decisions, and among the group of cases dealt with there were four death decisions. One was the case of a non-pensioner, one was a 5 per cent pensioner who had a slight gunshot wound, another was a 10 per cent pensioner, and the fourth was a 5 per cent pensioner, I think. These cases concerned veterans who had died, but in no case was death in any way related to the disability incurred on service. However, the commission was called upon to render a decision. Also in that group which I dealt with—it was only about 20 per cent of the number dealt with yesterday in the board room—there was about the same number of disability claims arising out of service in World War I. One was for bronchitis, which appeared within the last year. One was for a heart condition which had become apparent last year—the veteran wondered if there was any possibility of an award in connection with his service which terminated in 1917—and the others were along the same lines. Some were decisions which the commission had to render in respect of men who had entered a departmental hospital and who were undergoing treatment; the treatment branch asked us if there was any relationship between service and the condition being treated, and we render formal decisions. There were no cases heard yesterday with respect to veterans who held Returned Soldiers' insurance policies, but that is not an unusual occurrence at all and probably others I did not see yesterday had that problem. If members of the committee wish to have the figures from the first world war to date—up to the 31st of March, 1955—I would be very glad to get the number of applications dealt with by the commission, the number of favourable decisions rendered by the commission and the number refused, and I will give you the same figures with regard to decisions rendered not only by the boards of the commission as constituted today but by the pension appeal court which went out of being in 1939 and other adjudicating bodies earlier than that.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There might be a little overlapping. Each year you show in the annual report the number of awards granted in the course of that year, and that occurs in the table which was placed on the record this morning. Are

those all new awards or are they alterations in previous awards—that is to say, might they relate to a man whose award is raised from 5 per cent to 15 per cent?

Mr. MELVILLE: It has nothing to do with assessments. These are absolute entitlements for a new condition. Assessment is something entirely different. Pensioners are examined from time to time. The awards are stabilized for World War I as I explained yesterday, but the men may be re-examined at their own request. Figures are furnished in the annual report with regard to what has happened on re-examination, number increased, decreased, etc.

You observed Mr. Churchill that there are not as many statistics available this year as in the past. The commission through the records division maintains and endeavours to keep the record so that we shall be in a position to answer any enquiries from hon. members, and their records are excellent and very extensive. They became very bulky in the annual report when given in relation to the department as a whole and with regard to all its activities, and it was decided some years ago that we would reduce the content of the reports.

But at least every five years, and in some cases at less intervals than this we republish all that statistical information, so members of the committee will see that it has been maintained and is available. We have not cut out the maintenance of these records. Then exclusion was decided on purely in order to reduce the number of records which appeared in the annual report each year, some of which were repetitive.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would like to make an observation with regard to some of the matters which Brig. Melville has mentioned. The table on page 74 of the last report was referred to—we were talking about this yesterday—and it gives a summary of Canadian pension Commission decisions. It lists four types of application. Injury or disease, and death the the only two in which I am interested at the moment. The total this year under those two headings is 698 applications granted. Now the disability pensions awarded during the fiscal year were 251 and I am assuming that these 251 pensions awarded during the fiscal year are contained in the applications—the 698 applications granted as shown in the summary. What is the breakdown of these 251 new awards? Are they for injury or disease? They must be. They would not be for death.

Mr. MELVILLE: Where do you get the figure of 251 from?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Page 69—the second line, including the reinstated ones.

Mr. MELVILLE: Well, the total number of favorable decisions granted during the fiscal year ending the 31st of March 1954 was 490. Following a favorable decision an examination is carried out by the commission to determine whether or not the disability is of an assessable degree. Frequently it is not. It may be a very minor condition which may be subject to exacerbation—like bronchitis, for example—but at the time of examination it is negligible. But there is a record of bronchitis in service and the commission concedes entitlement. The eligible man is entitled to treatment by the department at any time for that condition. He is examined by the commission and if the disability is found to be of an assessable degree a pension is awarded. Then there are a number of other cases where the assessment is less than 5 per cent, and they receive what the Act terms a final payment amounting to not more than $160. That final payment is not in reality a final payment and the term is not quite accurate because a man holds his entitlement at all times in respect of his condition and if at any time assessment is in excess of 4 per cent he is immediately placed on pension and receives his monthly award, whatever the rate may be. But I would have to get an actual

breakdown of the figures in order to answer the question correctly, that is, the enquiry with relation to the 251 cases as reported on page 69 and the 490 favourable decisions mentioned on page 74.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was wondering what was meant by "favourable decisions" as contrasted with disability pension awards, and you have cleared that up, Brigadier Melville. While we are on that table, what is the explanation in connection with the 208 decisions concerning death?

Mr. MELVILLE: Well, we had a total number that fiscal year of 3,446 applications with respect to death. Some of the men died in departmental hospitals and some died at home. The commission is called upon to render a decision. As I mentioned before, the deceased may have held a Returned Soldier's insurance policy. He may have been a patient in a departmental hospital and the question has risen whether death was attributable to service in any way. We also wish to know whether we can go ahead and undertake certain expenditure in connection with burial and so on. These are decisions rendered by the commission. In the large majority of cases there are no dependent nor is application made by any dependent for a decision; it is a formal decision for administrative purposes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: These are the deaths of pensioners?

Mr. MELVILLE: Disability pensioners—no, not exactly that; World War I veterans, a number of whom may have been disability pensioners.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Without having the record before me—the morning after we have these discussions it is not possible to remember everything which is said and to be accurate about it—I think there was some remark made yesterday concerning the deaths of World War I persons who were not pensioners and with respect to whom the commission would have to make a decision. Have there been any cases like that—where a decision has been reached that death had been occasioned by reason of injury or disease arising out of World War I?

Mr. MELVILLE: There has been an exceptional case of that nature, but such cases are very unusual. I do not remember any recent ones, but it is quite within the realm of possibility that they should occur. A non-pensioner may die as a result of a certain condition, and even though his service record might show that he had never claimed for pension, there might be a connecting link. If they were we would rule accordingly, but such a case would be very unusual.

Mr. MACLEAN: Regarding the question of an applicant receiving the benefit of doubt, I would like some clarification as to how this applies in cases where doubt exists as to whether a veteran's disability has been affected or caused by his war service. I will make the point I have in mind specific. I was thinking chiefly of the case of diseases whose cause is not generally known. I am in the unfortunate position perhaps of being neither a lawyer or a doctor, so I am speaking subject to correction, but there is one case which has come to my knowledge. I have not seen the file directly, but it is a case which involves a man serving in the army who died of cancer, and I believe that it has been ruled that there was no connection between this condition and his service. Now, if the veteran is supposed to receive the benefit of the doubt how can it be established that there was no connection between his service and the condition from which he subsequently died? I realize I am making a lot of assumptions here, some of which may not be correct. However, I am merely looking for information.

Mr. MELVILLE: The responsibility of the commission is a very serious one. It is even more serious when the death of a member of the forces occurs and he has left dependents, and we are called upon to render a decision as to whether his death was in any way related to his service. You mentioned that

the Act makes provision for the extension of the benefit of the doubt. A very eminent jurist has said that before you can extend the benefit of any doubt a doubt must have been created. The commission collects all the evidence. Then we review all the service documents and the post-discharge history and possibly in a case such as you have mentioned death might have occurred in 1954 or 1955 from cancer but there would be nothing in the service history records to show any relationship whatever and possibly nothing in the post-discharge period until a year or two before death when the condition was diagnosed.

Mr. MACLEAN: If I may interrupt, the case I had in mind—and I would point out that it has just come to me second-hand—referred to a man who had died on service. He contracted cancer while in the service and he died in a service hospital.

Mr. MELVILLE: If a member of the forces dies on service during wartime, whether in World War I or in World War II, or during service in Korea, his dependents are pensionable irrespective of the circumstances unless death arises from misconduct. If death did arise from improper conduct and the man leaves dependents we may make an award to relieve their situation. I think there is one case in Mr. MacLean's own province which he knows about which has been dealt with along those lines. But when death occurs in peacetime service the situation is very different. In order that entitlement may be constituted it is necessary to establish that death arose out of, or was directly connected with, service. In other words that is the case of a naval rating or officer for example, death was the result of the performance of naval duty. We collect all the information—and not only do we collect information but we have at our disposal and available to us all the treatment facilities of the department. There are no better or more experienced members of the medical profession than those who are connected with the department, and we refer to these specialists the reports which we have and we ask for their advice and opinion. We say: "here are all the available medical reports. What is your opinion?" We take advantage of that opportunity to a very large extent. But cancer is a killer. I think it is very difficult, unless there is evidence of trauma to say what caused that cancer or whether it was directly concerned with a man's service in peacetime.

Mr. MACLEAN: My contention is that you do not have to prove that. It woud seem to me that the onus rests upon the commission to prove that it was not the result of war service because I do not see how you could say that the cancer was not in fact related to a man's war service. I am under the impression that there is very little known about what causes cancer. It is conceivable, though I know this may be a little far-fetched, that it might be caused by the type of dye used in service uniforms, and that this aggravated a condition which caused the cancer. It is not known what actually causes the disease, and it would seem to me that in those circumstances it could not be said that there was no connection between a man's service and the cause of his death.

Mr. MELVILLE: Well, it was always very difficult to make these decisions. One must be guided by medical opinion. As I say, we are able to take advantage of the very best medical opinion available on that subject. A member of the peacetime forces serving in Canada is probably occupied in a way which would differ very little from the normal civilian unless you can find some incident in his service which would lead you to believe that the disease could arise from or was directly concerned with a man's service we could not concede entitlement. There have been cases of cancer where we have found a connecting link and conceded entitlement, but there are a number of others where we cannot find any evidence whatsoever, or any doubt.

Mr. BROOKS: You go back to a man's record during his pre-enlistment period and state: "the history shows that his parents were subject to cancer" and then you conclude that he is subjected to it as well?

Mr. MELVILLE: Not in the case of cancer. You might find there is a family history of tuberculosis. But in the case of cancer, no.

Mr. BLAIR: I can appreciate Mr. MacLean's problem with regard to cancer, and I approve the attitude taken by Brig. Melville. I may say I had the honour of moving that particular clause in the Act, but I am still confused about it and I am going to cite a case which Mr. Melville knows very well to illustrate this. It concerns a friend of mine who received a shrapnel injury so severe that he had to have an amputation high on the shoulder, and they found that there was a fractured vertebra. One must admit that an injury such as he received from a gunshot wound must have represented a terrific shock when his shoulder was hit, but the benefit of the doubt clause does not apparently apply in his case. The pension Commission could not establish that the man had received an injury which broke his spine. They did not think that the injury which caused the loss of his arm and shoulder was sufficient to fracture his spine. That would seem to me to be a case where all the known information is contrary to the decision. The commission could not prove that the gunshot wound or the impact of the shrapnel did not cause the fracture, therefore it would seem to me that the man should receive the benefit of the doubt. I am very interested in that clause. I was connected with it and I moved it when it first came before the veterans' committee and at times I have been confused by some of the interpretations which have been placed upon it. I allow the fact that they have very experienced doctors on the board and I pay tribute to them but still I consider from my own standpoint that a man receiving an injury of such severity, all other things not being proven—the pension commission could not prove that there was any pre-enlistment history—should receive the benefit of the doubt. This is a source of disability for this man at the present time. Where does the benefit of the doubt come in? I admit that I am confused. I do not think that with such a history of severe injury and allowance should have been made that it could have caused a fractured spine.

Mr. MELVILLE: I have known that particular amputation case since the twenties, and the complaint arose in recent years. The commission gave it very serious consideration. I arranged for a personal appearance in Kingston before three of my colleagues and the case was referred again to most eminent local members of the medical profession, and they could not find any service relationship. However this represents a very serious problem and one which is constantly arising. Many members of the forces consider that because they claim for a pension and make statements in support of that claim, that by doing so they create a doubt, and that we should award pensions. I may say however, that not a day passes when there are not innumerable claims granted in respect of which the benefit of doubt is extended.

Mr. BROOKS: In that connection I was going to ask whether you could give the committee any idea how many cases there are in which the benefit of the doubt arises and where the veteran is given the benefit of the doubt? Is there any record available of such cases?

Mr. MELVILLE: The record is from my intimate knowledge of the cases which arise every day during the work of the commission. We deal with between 80 and 100 applications for entitlement each day. Of that number I would say that 25 per cent are granted with the benefit of the doubt. We pay attention to the reasoning of the claimant's case, and to the evidence which is placed before us. And in many cases, while it is impossible definitely to say that a disability was attributable to or was incurred or aggravated during war

service, it is equally impossible to say that it was not, and that there was no connection between the two. And if a doubt is created in our minds, we take advantage of the provisions of section 70 of the Act and we concede accordingly.

Mr. CANNON: In connection with the question which was raised by Mr. MacLean and Dr. Blair, would it not be correct to say that there seems to be confusion in some places between the benefit of the doubt and displacement of the burden of proof? The applicant has to establish that he is entitled to a pension. Some people seem to think that because an applicant makes his request and because he brings forward certain facts to support it that that displaces the burden of proof and that it is up to the commission to prove that he is not entitled to a pension. But the real fact is that it is always the responsibility of the applicant for a pension to establish facts which could at least give rise to a doubt, and if he is not able to establish those facts he is not entitled to the pension. But if he is able to establish a doubt, then he is entitled to the benefit of the doubt. However, it is still up to him to establish facts which would give rise to this doubt in the minds of those who have to deal with the case. That does not mean that the burden of proof is displaced.

Mr. BROOKS: Supposing a doubt arises as to whether he has established it or not?

Mr. BLAIR: I quite agree with Mr. Cannon, but I will go back to the case in question. In this case there is no other history of the man getting his spine hurt. There is a history of a service injury, so much so that the man is in receipt of a pension. The question of the benefit of the doubt does arise in my opinion. The pension commission does not seem to think on the advice of the members of the medical profession that the same violent impact which caused the amputation high on his shoulder could have caused the fracture. I feel that that is a case where the benefit of the doubt should be given.

The CHAIRMAN: Do they not go as far in a case like that as to say that it might have caused the fracture?

Mr. BLAIR: This was turned down.

The CHAIRMAN: I am asking you whether they did not go so far as to say that this might have caused the fracture?

Mr. BLAIR: I made an appeal on behalf of this injured man and that was my attitude—that the same injury which caused this high amputation—it was a shrapnel wound, and there would have been quite an impact—could have caused the injury to the spine, but I could not argue too much with the good doctors of the pension board.

The CHAIRMAN: Were you able to bring forward any medical evidence that the thing which did this damage might have done the other damage, or were you not able to get any evidence of that?

Mr. BLAIR: The evidence is apparent—the fact that the man lost his arm and shoulder.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you get any doctor to say that it might have caused this injury?

Mr. BLAIR: The injury is there. The commission's doctors did not think that the same injury which caused the loss of the arm and shoulder caused the fracture. But they were not able to prove that it did not cause it.

The CHAIRMAN: What I am curious to know is this—if medical evidence was brought forward to say that it might have been caused by that injury, after hearing which evidence the commission doctors said that in their opinion

it would not have caused the injury to the spine? If there was evidence that it might have been caused by the injury, what would the commission do in such a case?

Mr. BLAIR: I gave evidence which suggested that the spinal fracture might have been caused by the same injury.

The CHAIRMAN: I know of a case very much like that with regard to tuberculosis which irritated me very much. There was a medical history of continual suffering from colds and pains in the chest and one doctor said that there was something in the x-ray which had been taken during the man's service which indicated a cloud in the lungs. The other doctors said the cloud was due to some fault in the x-ray. Although it might have been incurred during service the doctors said they did not think it was. With regard to the question whether there any benefit of doubt was given in that case; there was a history of suffering during the two years prior to the man's discharge and there was even, as I say, the view expressed by one doctor that the x-ray plate showed a cloud; and then after the man's discharge the doctor said: "As, this man did not complain for more than a year after he was discharged and there there is not actual proof, connecting the onset of tuberculosis with the period of service the application must be refused." I am doubtful myself as to what extent any benefit of the doubt was given to that man because there must have been a period of about two years during which he reported sick repeadtedly. But he could not actually prove from x-rays that he was suffering from that condition and then more than a year passed after his discharge without any complaint. Therefore the idea prevailed that he must have incurred this T.B. after his discharge. But I have been wondering if it is not possible that it developed during service—I think there is that possibility shown by the man's medical history—whether that does not warrant the finding that a doubt has been raised I would be curious to know what Brigadier Melville has to say about what evidence you have got to bring forward in order to establish this doubt.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: May I suggest that Brigadier Topp, Chief Pensions Advocate in these cases, who, figuratively speaking, sits on the other side of the fence from the commission, may have some views on this subject. Would you explain your views on this to the committee, Brigadier Topp?

Mr. C. B. TOPP (*Chief Pensions Advocate, Department of Veterans Affairs*): May I say at once that in my capacity as the representative of probably 99 per cent of veterans who contest un avourable decisions of the commission, that the commission in our experience goes a very long way in extending the benefit of the doubt to the applicant. As the chairman of the commission has indicated, the question of defining just what the benefit of the doubt is a very complex matter. I think the best way in which I can explain it, perhaps, is to cite the particulars of a quite unusual case as illustration of what is being done. I read the decision concerning it only this morning before coming here.

The individual concerned was an officer and did his service in World War II. He contracted a knidney condition and was operated on for the removal of one kidney. Years later I think it was in 1952 or 1953—that member of the forces died from coronary thrombosis at a relatively early age. He died suddenly. There was no record of any heart condition during service, nor indeed was there any record of any heart condition over the post-discharge years. He unfortunately had not been periodically examined as many pensioners are. We even went to the length after his death of having the remains exhumed and an examination made by a pathologist to determine the precise cause of death, the extent of the arterio-sclerosis which brought on the

thrombosis and so forth. The commission over a series of renewal decisions in the board-room here consistently rejected that application, and we carried it to appeal, the basis of our argument being that kidney diseases, as we knew from medical advice, sometimes arose from hypertension or high blood pressure. High blood pressure in turn may have some effect in causing or bringing on coronary thrombosis. We had some medical support in writing for that theory. As I said, we brought the case on for appeal, we established the facts, as I have tried briefly to relate them to the committee before a hearing in western Ontario. We then brought before the appeal board at what we call a post-hearing in Montreal the evidence of two very eminent medical specialists, one an expert cardiologist, the other an expert pathologist. These two eminent witnesses testified first of all that there was a relationship between kidney disease and high blood pressure and therefore that there could be a relationship between high blood pressure and coronary thrombosis. They could not be dogmatic in any sense of the word. They merely said: "this could be; it might be; it might probably have been." In the result the appeal board—and it said so in so many words—granted the application by invoking section 70 of the Pension Act, which is the section requiring the commission and its appeal boards to give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant.

Mr. BROOKS: May I ask in that connection—and this is a case which was carefully worked out—whether a case of that kind would be taken as a precedent for similar cases which may be coming up and whether cases of precedent are established by the board? Would people be able to say that a particular case is "on all fours" with a similar case decided some months ago. If a certain decision has been reached in that case, could they expect it to be reached in other similar cases?

Mr. MELVILLE: The position is exactly as you say. The commission records those decisions. Not only do we record them but the veterans' bureau records them too. Brigadier Topp would circularize the decision in the case he has mentioned among all his advocates throughout the country so that they could take advantage of it in any case of a similar nature which might arise in the future.

Mr. BROOKS: If they had one which was not so favourable what would happen in that case?

Mr. BLAIR: I appreciate the case which has just been cited and it occurs to me that while it did a good deal of good perhaps moving that amendment many years ago it created a "headache" for the pensions commission. But at the same time, coming back to my case it was a matter of physics rather than perhaps a matter for the high class medical witnesses. The pension commission have not proved that this severe injury did not fracture the spine; therefore the benefit of the doubt should be given. It was a very severe injury and they have not established the fact that it could not have caused the fracture and everyone here will allow that when a man is hit like that with a chunk of shrapnel there is a terrific impact.

The CHAIRMAN: "Benefit of the doubt" is a legal phrase put by judges to juries all the time. They say there must be more than a remote possibility—there must be a doubt such as you would act upon in the ordinary affairs of you life. Almost anything is remotely possible, but it cannot be a fantastic possibility. It must be something reasonably possible. In applying that particular rule it is a matter of the commission exercising its judgment as to whether there is a real doubt there, a real possibility, or whether there is a very remote one.

Mr. BLAIR: This is not remote at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not dealing with your case. But in cases of that kind I can see that the commission is dealing with one of the most difficult problems which the courts have to deal with, and in providing for dealing with it various alternatives have been suggested. One is that provision should be made for these matters to be referred to some court. However, this would lead to great rigidity and they would be tied down by predecents. It was felt that it was better to leave these questions to be determined by a commission in which parliamentary and veterans organizations had confidence; that it would interpret the Act in a sympathetic way, and that its decisions would not be subject to appeal outside their own body. We have upheld that view right along. My own opinion is that in cases like this there is bound to be a difference of opinion as to whether a possibility has been established on the basis of which action can be taken, or whether it is quite properly held to be too remote. I think that the commission has done a very satisfactory job in recent years. But I know that if you get interested in a case yourself you sometimes naturally think that there was not enough consideration given to the section. I think also it is good that a point like this, which is so difficult and which raises considerations of such importance to veterans all over the country, can be discussed here and that we should have the benefit of hearing Brigadier Topp and Brigadier Melville explain these matters to us, and that they in turn may have the benefit of hearing us express our attitude, too.

Mr. BLAIR: That is my attitude, too. But I feel that a man could not have a fractured spine like this man has without having a history. I appreciate the difficulties of the Pensions Commission but at the same time I think it is a good thing that the whole question should be clarified and that we should be talking the matter over this morning.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Is there not a point there, Dr. Blair—the one which Mr. Cannon made a few minutes ago in speaking about this particular case. You said that the commission had not established that the spinal injury was not due to this other injury. Isn't that where the error lies—that for many people the benefit of the doubt is interpreted as meaning that the onus of bringing evidence is now on the commission and that the commission has to prove that that was not the cause of the injury?

Mr. BLAIR: Quite.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not correct, which is the point which Mr. Cannon made. If you want to give the benefit of the doubt to an applicant it is still up to the applicant to establish before the commission such evidence as will create a doubt in the minds of those who sit upon the board. It does not require the commission to bring forward evidence to prove that the application is wrong.

Mr. BLAIR: But this man's injury is apparent. This injury is there. Those are the facts.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Then I suggest you might criticize the decision as being a bad one, but not ask that the commission should prove that the man's spinal injury was not due to the first injury you mentioned.

Mr. WESELAK: Before the section can come into play at all there would have to be positive evidence.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: In this case Dr. Blair claims there is.

Mr. BLAIR: It is apparent.

Mr. CANNON: When we start discussing individual cases we might go on to infinity. When we were discussing the immigration estimates I think the principle was laid down that we should not start discussing individual cases because we might keep on doing it forever. As to the general principle, I

think the minister has clarified the point which I tried to make. The onus of proof is nowhere displaced. It is always on the applicant.

The CHAIRMAN: Were you going to deal with this, Mr. Melville?

Mr. MELVILLE: Perhaps I had better quote the section and then reply to the remarks of the chairman. This is section 70 of the Pension Act:

> 70. Notwithstanding anything in this Act, on any application for pension the applicant is entitled to the benefit of the doubt, which means that it is not necessary for him to adduce conclusive proof of his right to the pension applied for, but the body adjudicating on the claim shall draw from all the circumstances of the case, the evidence adduced and medical opinions, all reasonable inferences and presumptions in favour of the applicant.

I shall try to deal, without quoting a specific case, with the remarks of the chairman.

With regard to tuberculosis the commission is faced with a very serious problem, as you well realize. Whenever we have a claim for tuberculosis, we study the documentation and the post discharge history. There is nothing in the Pension Act, but this is the practice of the commission, that if there are signs and symptoms of tuberculosis within twelve months of discharge service, there is no question raised whatsoever, and we will concede entitlement because the condition may have been latent.

Beyond a twelve month period, if we can find anything relating back into the service period at all, we concede entitlement. We study the enlistment film, and any films completed during service. We study the discharge x-ray films and the x-ray films taken in the post-discharge period. We review them and render our decision.

We go outside of that, realizing that we are dealing with difficult cases, exactly as has been stated by the chairman; we have provided for the services of two specialists. One is the secretary of the Canadian Tuberculosis Association. When we are dealing with these difficult cases he comes to the commission and he will review ten or a dozen cases in an afternoon or an evening.

In conjunction with the senior medical officer of the commission he will review these cases, and we get his opinion. There we are going outside to the secretary of the Canadian Tuberculosis Association, to a well experienced doctor who is thoroughly versed in the particular problems of tuberculosis.

We get that advice and opinion from outside the commission. And we have one other specialist in Ottawa, a World War II veteran who is a specialist in that field, and we make use of him as well. He comes in, so that we do, in all cases, as I say, go outside and get the very best evidence we can.

As an illustration of our difficulty, let me say that a claim for tuberculosis came before an appeal board. It was heard, and when the appeal board returned to Ottawa, the presiding member came in to see me. He said "I do not wish to discuss the merits of this claim because that is none of your business." And it was none of my business. It was still the responsibility of the three members of the appeal board. He said "I heard the evidence and it has worried me ever since; I want to discuss it with you and tell you exactly what happened."

The applicant was claiming for tuberculosis incurred during service in World War II and he gave his evidence and the evidence of two men who served with him, both of whom claimed that he was billeted in Holland with a certain individual, and that this individual along with other members of his family had tuberculosis and that was the contact. The presiding officer said, "If that is so, there will be no doubt about this claim."

He said, "I talked to my two colleagues and we are not quite satisfied." I said to him "I can resolve this for you in a matter of ten days." And he

said "How", and I said "I know that your decision is none of my business, but I will get you information. You told me that this applicant was in a certain billet in Holland. I shall write to our diplomatic representative there and have someone go and find out from the mayor or the head of the municipality just exactly with regard to this individual and the members of his family, as to what is the family history. Is there a history of tuberculosis?"

That same day I sent a message off, through diplomatic channels; I wrote directly to our ambassador and I received a reply within ten days.

The reply was that the man in Holland was one of the most respected members of the community; he was the local baker, and that the family had lived in that home for almost three generations and that neither he nor any member of his family at any time had suffered from tuberculosis.

I gave that information to the members of the appeal board and they proceeded to render their decision. I put that forward as evidence of the serious problems which confront the commission.

Our task is not an easy one. Our job is to award and not to deny pensions, subject to the provisions of the Act. We also take advantage of section 70 of the Act which allows us to extend the benefit of a doubt.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the case which has just been cited has nothing whatever to do with the benefit of the doubt clause. That was a case of digging up conclusive evidence. I would return to Dr. Blair's case.

We agreed when the estimates of the immigration department were up that we were not going to go into individual cases unless they illustrated a principle. This is a case which illustrates a principle. I think there is no doubt about that. It has been stated that the onus is upon the applicant to produce the facts which would be calculated to create a doubt at least in the minds of the board as to whether or not the applicant is entitled to an award.

Here is a case where the doubt was presented. This man had suffered a very severe injury in an area of his body in which certain medical opinions at least considered it was likely that it would have caused auxiliary injuries to his spine, but which did not become evident until years later.

It would seem to me that unless the board had conclusive medical evidence that such a thing was impossible then it was certainly a case for the benefit of the doubt, and that merely contrary opinion as to the possibility of it was not enough to relieve the commission of its duty to invoke that clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The point there, Mr. Cameron, is this: I do not think they said it was likely to have caused this injury. The most any doctor would say was that it conceivably might have. The question is just what the possibilities would be. I do not know; they might have been as one to one; one to ten; one to a hundred; or one to a thousand. Time comes into it. It might remain a possibility, and whether it be one out of one, or one out of a thousand, I do not think the latter would be a case which could be regarded as a reasonable doubt. The commission has to decide in each case on the facts of the case whether there is a doubt on the basis of which they have the right to say that this might have been caused—that it is reasonable to suppose that it might have been so caused. They must decide whether it is just a conjecture or just a remote possibility, in which event I do not think anybody would say that they should find that a doubt on which they could act existed.

In other words, what the commission is trying to apply here is what juries have to apply all the time, when they are told by the judge that the Crown must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. That doubt is not anything that may be conjectured up as a remote possiblity. It must be a doubt which would occur in the ordinary affairs of life, and the commission must apply it in these cases in favor of the applicant.

We have decided over and over again that it should be that way. I think the veterans organization and everybody else felt that if it was left in an elastic condition rather than subject to rigid legal interpretation, it would be much better, and I think that it has worked out better for the veteran himself, that way than if it had been made otherwise. The difficulty is to decide whether a doubt is a remote possibility or something under which they should act under this section. As everybody knows this is something which sometimes hangs up a jury for two or three days in trying to arrive at a decision, and sometimes it leads to disagreement of juries and the necessity for a re-trial. It is not anything we can actually decide here. I think we would be going beyond our terms of reference in fully discussing any particular item such as Dr. Blair mentioned here. The question of tuberculosis which the chairman raised was simply to indicate how difficult it is to deal with these cases. I think that was quite in order.

Mr. BLAIR: It was not my intention to bring about a clash of opinion of legal and medical ideas, but you used the word "conjecture". To me this is more than a conjecture. So I would say that the odds are very much cut down rather than what you cited. The mere fact this man received such a terrific impact, causing such a severe wound, could mean that anything could happen. It is more than a one to one; it is rather a ten to one.

The CHAIRMAN: I was not dealing with your case. This may have been one, to one, one to ten, or one to a hundred. They have got to decide it.

Mr. BLAIR: I do not believe in citing individual cases, but because of my interest in this benefit of the doubt clause in previous years I am still interested. I appreciate the trouble to the pension board and I am still interested in the interpretation of this clause of the Act. I again say that it is a good thing that we threshed this out before the committee because every member of the house and every interested person, as well as the pensions advocates are concerned about this clause. I think it is a good idea to clarify it and to find out something more about it. It will help us in dealing with future cases.

Mr. CANNON: I do not want to start another argument, but I would like to ask Brigadier Melville if he agrees that the section of the Pensions Act applies to the same reasonable doubt with which a jury has to deal in court cases? As a lawyer, I know that a reasonable doubt is one which would move a reasonable man, in the ordinary affairs of life. It has to be quite a substantial doubt. I wonder if the doubt which is required in this case has to be as substantial as the doubt which is referred to in courts of law?

The CHAIRMAN: The reason I said that was that "reasonable" means that they must give the benefit of any doubt; I presume it means a reasonable doubt. I would be interested to hear from Brigadier Melville on that point.

Mr. MELVILLE: I am sure that I do not want to get into a tangle with so many lawyers. I am neither a lawyer nor a doctor. I am an engineer.

In my opinion the commission is most excellently constituted. We have to interpret a statute. The great bulk of our decisions is based on medicine, and medicine is not an exact science.

The composition of the commission is as follows: four lawyers, four doctors, and at the present time five laymen of various pursuits in life. When we come to deal with and give a decision on a claim we certainly have to deal, first of all, with the law, as we interpret the statute. Medicine is a very important factor and that comes in too. If we deal with the law alone, and strictly in accordance with the law, I would say that many claims granted would have been rejected. But we have an escape clause, a generous clause in the Canadian legislation. Our Act provides for the benefit of the doubt, and we extend it.

We have lay commissioners who may not agree with the lawyers on one side, or with medical opinion on the other. All factors must be considered. If a doubt is created, when we discuss these cases in the board room, that doubt is resolved and we say: "All right, that is the end of it." That is the way it goes.

Mr. CANNON: In other words in applying the benefit of the doubt clause, the commission gives to it a broader and more generous interpretation than the law courts would.

Mr. MELVILLE: I can assure you that is absolutely so.

Mr. BROOKS: As a member of the committee I might say that it was never intended that the strict legal interpretation of the benefit of the doubt be given. You will remember that. It was brought up time and time again, and we decided against sticking to the strict legal interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why they were given the right to decide the law there, so that there would not be any appeal to the courts.

Mr. BLAIR: I think we should leave this case to the engineers as being a physical possibility.

Mr. MacLEAN: It was I who initiated this discussion. I did not do it in a critical way, or with the thought that I did not think that the benefit of the doubt is not given often enough, or interpreted generously enough. But speaking merely as a layman and as a veteran, I must say that I am a bit concerned, especially in the case of men who are presently in the service, or who die while on active service, when they are refused a pension on the grounds that their service had no connection with their cause of death.

In other words, you are saying in effect under these circumstances that a man would have died anyway, whatever the malady he happened to have had, even if he never joined the services. In my way of thinking, statistically, of course, that is true. There are just as many people who die as civilians from cancer or tuberculosis or whatever you wish to suggest as an example, as there are in the services, and perhaps more. But I think it is a very difficult thing in a particular case to say that had this man never joined the service he would have died for the same reason, or from the apparent symptoms. That is what you are forced to do if you reason that his service has no connection with his death. It would seem to me that in those cases when a man is in the service, and the actual thing which initiated his disability is completely unknown. that it would be fair to assume that it had some connection with his service, or in other words, with the conditions he was living under.

Mr. MELVILLE: There are no cases which concern the commission more today than claims with respect to disability or death arising out of peacetime service. The Act provides that when the disability or death arose out of or was directly connected with service entitlement may be conceded.

And with that in mind, some years ago I instituted a procedure whereby when a claim is in respect to peacetime service it is dealt with by my colleagues who are in Ottawa, at an afternoon meeting. We have the benefit of various approaches and viewpoints with regard to the claim, which is very thoroughly and seriously scrutinized. The responsibility is a very serious one.

A member of the forces was in uniform. He was driving his own car when he suffered an accident. We cannot say that the accident was directly connected with his service and we have to rule accordingly, and he and the dependants are naturally grievously concerned because he may have been in uniform at the time of the accident and so on. But it is very, very clear that we cannot render a favourable decision under those circumstances, he was on pleasure not duty.

Mr. MacLEAN: I want to thank Brigadier Melville for his excellent explanation of the situation. It has cleared up the problem greatly in my mind. As far as I am concerned I have no cause for severe criticism. It is only on

behalf of the veterans that I would like to feel that we are being as generous as it is possible to be, and that if it is the intention of the Act to be on the generous side, that it is understood all the way down, or, on the other hand, that the veteran does not get the impression that he is entitled to something to which he is not entitled.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. MacLean may have had a happier experience with the pension commission than I have had, but I am inclined to be more critical of this particular section 70, and I am far from convinced that the benefit of the doubt clause is applied on occasions when it should be applied.

It was written into the Act because of the difficulty involved in adducing conclusive evidence. It was intended to permit the pension commission to make a presumption in favour of the applicant. I hope some of the statements which have been made here this morning won't be construed as advice to the commission—because I thought that the statement of the minister, for example, gave a different meaning to this Act, and what it intended as he read it.

I am very happy that it has been read into the record. I think that the benefit of the doubt clause needs to be considered pretty seriously by the pension commission. The pension advocates tell me—and Brigadier Melville has told me on many occasions—that it is invoked very, very frequently. But I still have some reservations in regard to it and perhaps our discussion this morning will have some influence on the commission in the application of this particular section.

I take it that it was introduced primarily because of the difficulty of establishing cases affecting men who served in the first world war. We all know that the documents were not kept in the same shape in the first world war as they were in the second world war. We were not subject to x-ray examinations, and the first world war people have so little to rely on. But nowadays the practice has become such that you have to have everything written down on your documents, and I fancy that there must be more sick parties and hospitalizations in the modern army than there was in the past, because the fellow in the first world war had to have something written down on his document, and if it was not written down on his document then his chances were somewhat limited for the future.

Let me ask you this question: with regard to the first world war people Mr. MacLean launched us into this benefit of the doubt clause and into medical opinions, which is pretty dangerous ground for a layman; but I am interested in circumstances such as this: the first world war men were subject to the effects of poison gas when they were in France.

I would judge there were very few soldiers of that era who served for any length of time in the trenches or battlefields who did not at some time or another inhale poison gas. I was talking to a member of the House of Commons yesterday who recalled being seriously ill from poison gas, when he was overseas, but he did not go to hospital. There would be nothing on his document to indicate it.

I have been wondering to what extent the effects of poison gas have been taken into consideration in respect to applications from World War I personnel. The reason I raise the subject now is that I recall about eighteen years ago hearing a paper read by a distinguished medical doctor about the after-effects of poison gas. The only reason I can recall it now is that it was so startling. His findings were that the effects of poison gas might recur at the end of fifteen years after a person had been exposed to it.

What has been the experience of the pensions commission with regard to claims arising out of exposure to poison gas in the first world war? Is there a body of opinion?

Mr. MELVILLE: No, I would hardly say there was a body of opinion, but there are many who served in World War I and who had long service in the trenches and who were not exposed to poison gas, or if they were exposed to the gas, wore their box respirator, such as you had, and as Brigadier Topp had, and as a number of us had, in fact as I had myself; and I have had no ill effects.

There are other men who subsequently to discharge from World War I service suffered from the effects of poison gas, and there are any number of them who are in receipt of disability pensions today. There are other men who applied in recent years and who claimed that the bronchial condition today from which they suffer or some other condition, is a result of being gassed in World War I.

As you say, there is nothing in the records; there is nothing in the intervening history to tie it up, and it is very difficult for the commission to say "Oh yes, that condition today is related to World War I service. Again if there is evidence and medical advice in support of the application, and if we think there is a connecting link, we shall concede, naturally, but if we cannot, then under the Act it is not possible for us to do so.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Would you say that the effect of gas in the First World War has been a major factor in the granting of pensions?

Mr. MELVILLE: No, unless it was in the case of the particular group who were exposed to it in the early stages at Ypres and who were pensioned in the immediate years following World War I.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I notice that the nomenclature for diseases and injuries in the First World War differs from that in the case of the Second World War. World War I veterans applying for pensions and getting awards—are their listings made under that list of "diseases and injuries" and so on or are they listed under the new standard morbidity code as it is called, for World War II?

Mr. MELVILLE: You have touched on something which gave rise to considerable concern on my part because of the problem Records had to maintain statistics. As to the change to this standard morbidity code—Dr. Blair is probably more familiar with than I am—what we endeavour to do is to conform to that in our classification because it is a code which is used internationally and the records which are maintained and which are made available play an important part in international investigation of these statistics.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In some of these reports—for example in the 1953 report—you list disability pensioners for World War I under medical nomenclature. How do you relate the awards of, say, 1951, 1952 and 1953 made under the standard morbidity code to fit in to these titles?

Mr. MELVILLE: This is a problem which is really undertaken by the treatment branch with the support of the Records Division but we are endeavouring to use that code and we have applied it in the case of World War II. The setting up of the whole of the statistical information has been done by the officer in the department which is responsible for that and he has to correlate some and bracket them together. That is all I can say with regard to that.

The CHAIRMAN: About these gas cases—I wonder whether Mr. Topp can deal with this matter. Have you any view on these cases, Mr. Topp?

Mr. TOPP: Yes Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that it means a great deal to me as a pensions advocate to hear the importance of the benefit of the doubt clause being so firmly impressed on the mind of the chairman of the commission. I am doing that myself every day. On the subject of gas, I think that Colonel Churchill will appreciate the difference between what the original people were subjected to in the very early

days and what happened in the latter stages of the war. In other words, in those early days troops who were subjected to phosgene gas and who inhaled phosgene gas and who subsequently developed bronchitis and other respiratory conditions are almost invariably, in my experience, pensioned by the commission whether there is an actual record of exposure to gas or not.

The commission just requires that we shall prove that the individual was in the area where gas was used and at the time it was used. If we establish that and if we establish that he has bronchitis or something that could be related to gas we encounter very little difficulty. On the other hand most of us who served in the forward area during World War I were at some time or another frequently mildly exposed to tear gas, mustard gas and other forms of gas coming from shells. We do have a bit more difficulty when we encountered that kind of thing. It is a very common experience for our advocates to have an applicant come forward and say that he was exposed to gas at some such time. He probably was, but there is no record of it simply because at the time there were no ill effects, or at least no ill effects of a continuing nature. With respect particularly to what was called by the troops mustard gas—I have forgotten the technical name for it—there are certain eye conditions which may develop many years afterwards, so we are informed by medical opinion. When we get a case where either there is a record of exposure to mustard gas or proof that the individual was in an area where mustard gas was used at the time and where a man subsequently develops, shall we say, keratitis the commission will usually grant entitlement without too much trouble. I saw a case only yesterday where that had been done. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I can add much more on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any further questions on this item—administration?

Mr. BROOKS: I just wanted to ask one further question. We have a great many small pensioners who also receive war veterans' allowances. I should like to ask Brigadier Melville if he can give us any idea of the number of small pensioners involved.

Mr. MELVILLE: I have not that figure with me, but I am sure Mr. Mace would be able to produce it. While he is looking for that figure may I say that I have ordered extra copies of the proceedings of this committee.

Do not think I hesitate for one moment to bring your observations before my colleagues. I do that after a debate in the House or after a special committee on veterans affairs has met. I "go to town" strongly and what has been said here this morning with regard to the benefit of the doubt and the other matters raised will certainly be brought to their attention.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I know that we have these figures somewhere but I do not think that Mr. Mace has them here with him.

The CHAIRMAN: We can table them this afternoon, Mr. Brooks. Are there any other questions on this item of administration?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am far from being finished. I have been pursuing two courses of enquiry. I have expressed concern over World War I pensioners and the years that have elapsed from the time of the war until their pensions have been dealt with. I was wondering now with regard to World War II if the pension problems of the personnel of that war are being dealt with more rapidly than was the case in the early post-war years after World War I. I notice that in the first ten years after World War I the number of people awarded pensions rose from roughly 15,000 to 50,000 and that for World War II, in 1945, there were in round numbers 15,000 receiving pensions. What is the figure for 1955?

Mr. MELVILLE: The total number who were awarded disability pensions—

Mr. CHURCHILL: For World War II.

Mr. MELVILLE: The total number of disability pension awards for World War II as at the end of February is 100,154.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is exclusive of dependents?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes—I can give you the figure for dependents if you wish to have it.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No. I am not dealing with dependents.

Mr. BROOKS: Were there only 10,000 at the end of the war in 1945?

Mr. MELVILLE: 15,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: It seems to me that it is about the same ratio of pensioners ten years after the end of the war to the number of servicemen engaged as was the case after the first war.

Mr. MELVILLE: The disability pension figures are very interesting. In 1918 there were 15,335; ten years later in 1928 the figure was 50,635, and in 1940 First World War disability pensions reached their peak, and the total was 80,133.

Mr. BROOKS: How do the casualties compare as between World War I and World War II—have you got that information available?

Mr. MELVILLE: Well, 650,000 bore the badge of Canada in World War I; 60,000 met death and passed on. In the second world war total enlistments, including both men and women, numbered approximately 1,100,000. Of that number we had 42,000 deaths. Now, with regard to those who were wounded and disabled. In World War I the number of wounded was 138,166, and after World War II the total was 53,145. Of course, the figures for World War II are exclusive of Newfoundland figures because Newfoundland did not come in until Union in 1949.

Mr. BROOKS: Would you consider that the figures indicate that it was more difficult for World War I veterans to get pensions than it is for World War II veterans, judging from the fact that these figures have increased from 15,000 in ten years to 100,000 in the case of World War II and from 50,000 in the same length of time in the case of World War I although they had far more casualties?

Mr. MELVILLE: I think the answer to that question is that there is no legislation as broad in its scope and as generous in its treatment of veterans as the Pension Act of Canada. Any disability which was incurred or aggravated during service may be pensionable and that takes in a very wide field. That is why we have so many claims coming in now—a condition becomes manifest, and the endeavour is to establish a relationship back to service in World War II. But our situation with respect to World War II was improved to a great extent because when I was called to this job I paid personal visits to the directors general of medical services for the navy, the army and the air force and I stressed that the benefits which would accrue under the Act would depend to a very great extent upon the thoroughness with which they carried out their medical boards on discharge and as we know the discharge medical boards for World War II were much more complete than for World War I.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In relation to the question of Mr. Brooks, the table for 1949 for World War I shows under two headings gunshot wounds, injuries and fractures—this is on page 114 of the 1949 annual report. These tables are not repeated in the 1954 report which makes it uninteresting for the committee and that is why I object to the limitation in the 1954 report. If you combine those totals for wounded men of the first world war there were 27,800 on

the pension list in round numbers. Now take the similar description for World War II, gunshot wounds on service, and the accidents and injuries on service for 1949—and that is on page 132—and combine that and you get 34,600 so that comparing the two wars in 1949 you had out of 138,000 wounded of the first world war 27,800 who were pensioners and in the second world war 52,000 wounded and 34,500 who were on the pension list. I think the answer to Colonel Brooks' question is that the machinery for placing wounded men on the pension list is working more rapidly after the second world war than after the first?

Mr. MELVILLE: There is no question about that whatsoever. I think I mentioned at an earlier meeting of this committee that we examined the proceedings of every World War II discharge medical board and also that our work is up to date in appeal boards all the time. There are no delays. Hearings are laid on which will take care of all appeal board applications listed with us now and all will be heard by the end of June.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is also fair to say that following the first war many soldiers knew they should get a pension but as long as they could get along without it they did not apply. There was a different attitude after the second war because it was understood that the medical report would be examined on discharge and if a person was entitled to a pension he got it without applying at all.

Mr. BROOKS: The old fellows were tougher too, I think.

The CHAIRMAN: I would not dare say that.

Mr. MacLEAN: Generally speaking, do you not agree that the veterans of World War II were more aware of their entitlement and were more anxious to establish claims at an early date rather than let it go until it was difficult to establish them?

The CHAIRMAN: They also benefitted from the experience of their fathers to some extent.

Mr. MELVILLE: The Pension Act was 1919, and in the years preceding 1919 if disability was incurred examination was made and if disability was established authority was given for the payment by Order in Council.

Then the Pension Act came into being in 1919 and the situation was taken in hand. Throughout the years there have been many improvements and a great many added benefits incorporated into the legislation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was interested in the comparison between the first and second world war and that is on the basis of degrees of disability. You show a table in the report of 1954, page 82, for World War II showing the degree of disability for 96,094 people on the pension roll. The corresponding table for World War I does not occur in that book.

Mr. MELVILLE: I could help you there.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I was wondering if you could give that. You may perhaps put it on the record complete so that the comparison might be made, but I made division for 5 per cent to 47 per cent and then from 48 per cent to 100 per cent in order to make a comparison. 75 per cent of the World War I men are in the group 5 to 47 per cent and 25 per cent are in the group 48 per cent to 100 per cent. World War II 83 per cent are in the group 5 per cent to 47 per cent and 17 per cent are in the group 48 per cent to 100 per cent. Perhaps you could let us have the distribution for 1955 on that basis?

Mr. MELVILLE: I think that I furnished you with these figures. They are as of the 31st December, 1953. Those you quoted are correct. 25·48 per cent disability pensioners whose pension is 50 per cent and more and there are 74·52 per cent whose awards are less than 50 per cent; that is World War I,

With respect to World War II the actual figure is 16.98 per cent who were 50 per cent or more and 83 per cent who are less than 50 per cent. The answer there is fairly clear. Disabilities increase with advancing years and you will find as we are finding that a number are progressing up to higher degrees of disability; but the figure as at the end of December, 1954, will not differ very materially from the percentages which I have quoted. The average disability pension payment for World War I was 32·64 and World War II 24·53. The average age of disability pensioners World War I is 65 plus, and World War II is 41 plus.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is a constant review of the pensioners and a change in entitlement or a change in degree of disability. I cannot lay my hand on the figures now, but I noticed that for World War I although there had been a reduction I think between 1951 and 1953 of about 4,000 pensioners, I suppose mostly by death, nevertheless the ones in the group 98 to 100 per cent had increased appreciably. Is that due to a change after examination or would that be in some instance due to new awards being made?

Mr. MELVILLE: If it is an increase from 90 to 100 per cent or 80 to 100 per cent that of course is an increased assessment; in other words there has been an increase in the degree of pensionable disability. You will probably have a pensioner in receipt of pension for tuberculosis and his award may be 50, 60 or 70 per cent, and his tuberculosis is re-activated and he is re-admitted to a sanitorium for treatment. On discharge if he was a case of active pulmonary tuberculosis we pay a pension of 100 per cent for two years and then he is examined and if his condition is improved we will reduce it but not below 80 per cent and then re-examine him at stated intervals. Most World War I pensions are now stabilized, unless the disability pensioner wishes to be re-examined, when we immediately arrange for a re-examination.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Could you furnish us with a table showing the degree of disability for the awards made during this last war, for the new people coming on the pension roll with respect to World War I as well as World War II?

Mr. MELVILLE: You mean showing the assessments, yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: According to that type of table.

Mr. MELVILLE: That is, the new awards in the last fiscal year.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is right.

Mr. MELVILLE: And you want to know the various classes of assessments?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes.

Mr. MELVILLE: I would be glad to get that for you. Is that for World War I or World War II, or both?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Both. I am just about finished Mr. Chairman, but not quite. The pension commission deals with people presently in the active army, does it not, who, by reason of injury are discharged. That is correct is it not?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes, we deal with all members of the forces, be it navy, army, or air.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not see any table in the 1954 report indicating the number of personnel from the active army who come before the pension commission. Is that listed separately?

Mr. MELVILLE: I can let you have it. As at the end of February, 1955, 490 awards were made for payment for disability incurred during service in peacetime; and 284 awards were in effect to dependents.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Have you the total which the increase would make in the annual liability? What increase in liability is caused by this?

Mr. MELVILLE: I have it. The total awards in payment are 774, that is for disability and dependants, and the annual liability as at the end of February of this year was $684,712.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have one or two more questions, Mr. Chairman, but I see it is now just about 12.30 o'clock.

Mr. MELVILLE: As at the end of the last fiscal year, Mr. Churchill, the corresponding figure for the previous year was $529,832.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: As you are not through, Mr. Churchill, we will adjourn now until 3:30 this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SITTING

APRIL 26, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen we have a quorum. We are still on the item of administration. You have some further questions I believe Mr. Churchill?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Just at 12.30 I was asking about the number of pensioners from peacetime services and Brigadier Melville gave some figures. I did not make a note of the period, and I wonder if we could have them repeated?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: While Brigadier Melville is looking for those figures I think it was you, Mr. Churchill, who asked for the number of recipients of war veterans' allowance who were recipients of small disability pensions—no, it was Mr. Brooks who asked that question. The number is 10,117.

Mr. MELVILLE: The answer to your question Colonel Churchill is as follows: the figures I quoted were pensions awards in connection with the services in peacetime.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Over what period of time?

Mr. MELVILLE: Right up to the 28th of February 1955. It is the total.

Mr. CHURCHILL: May I ask with regard to, say, the last two or three years—or can you give me the figures for the last five years—the number of applications which were granted and the number which were disallowed or declined?

Mr. MELVILLE: I am not sure whether I have those figures available immediately, but I will be very glad to get them for you.

Mr. CHURCHILL: To follow up that matter, I wanted to know with regard to the ones disallowed how many of them were based on section 13 of the Act, subsection 2—a matter which was discussed to some extent this morning; the section which deals with the question of whether or not a disability or an injury arises out of or is directly connected with military service. My question merely amounts to this: how many of the applications have been declined on the basis of that part of the Act?

Mr. MELVILLE: All of them, Colonel Churchill, because all of those applications which I have referred to and the numbers which I quoted relate to peacetime service and there is only one section of the Act which relates to service in peacetime and that is section 13, subsection 2.

Mr. CHURCHILL: When you have the figures for the number disallowed I may have something else to say with regard to that. This leads me, Mr. Chairman, to another matter. It is within the competence of the Pension Commission to interpret the Act, and the Pension Commission, I think in 1949,

agreed that the Veterans' Bureau might make suggestions or present arguments to the commission with regard to the interpretation of the various sections. How much of that has been done? What sections have been given an interpretation by the commission?

Mr. MELVILLE: It is some years ago now since the committee on interpretation was set up by the commission. That committee on interpretation consists of five commissioners and if I received a request from the veterans' bureau that they wish to present a brief and to discuss the interpretation of a section of the Act, a hearing is arranged and arguments are presented by the veterans' bureau, heard by those chosen colleagues and reported on by them to the commission. That procedure is by no means restricted to the veterans' bureau. The Canadian Legion has appeared before the commission on two or three occasions and the veterans' bureau on four or more I would think. But they would have actual knowledge, and they are here.

Mr. TOPP: Mr. Chairman, some years ago after my return from service, it became apparent that some doubt existed as to the proper meaning of certain sections in the Pension Act, in particular with regard to the section which has reference to medical records of the presence of a disabling condition prior to the enlistment of a member of the forces. We felt from an examination of individual decisions of the commission that perhaps some appeal boards and perhaps some members of the commission itself were not entirely in agreement as to what the proper interpretation should be, and we felt that certain decisions were in conflict one with another for that reason. Those considerations led me to request the chairman of the commission to provide the bureau with an opportunity of presenting argument upon questions of interpretation. The commission, as the chairman has informed the committee, at once agreed to that suggestion and there have since been a number of hearings. The first one, I think, had reference to the amending of the word "record" as used in the Act, and I am glad to say that this matter was determined in the manner in which we thought it should be determined and the practice of the commission in its application is now in our judgment more uniform than it previously was. In such cases as we have had occasion to bring before the interpretation committee, Mr. Wilson, who is the senior legal member of my staff, has represented the bureau and I think, Mr. Chairman, if you have no objection, that it might be well if Mr. Wilson were to mention the particular sections which he has dealt with.

Mr. E. V. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, the bureau has appeared on a number of occasions before this interpretation committee. I do not know how many appearances we have made; they extend back over quite a period of years—as far back as 1949—but as my chief has just mentioned we have had several interpretations dealing with the interpretation section of the Act—questions of "record" and "evidence"—and we have had several interpretations dealing with the meanings of decisions given by judicial bodies in the past—tribunal decisions in which the actual meaning of those decisions and their judicial effect came into question. We have made several of these appearances. We have also made one appearance in connection with the interpretation of section 36 of the Act, as it now is, having regard to its effect in a case where a pension was awarded to an air raid warden. We have had several other matters before us for consideration, but it is a little hard at the moment to recall them all. That, however, is the general trend. Incidentally I have one brief in the course of preparation on my desk now, and one or two others in view which we are working on. I do not suppose that the committee will want me to deal in detail with any of these interpretation applications, but in general those are the type of matters which

we put forward for interpretation. There are a good many things in the Act, of course, which are not a proper subject, probably, for interpretation. I do not recall, as I said, any further points.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any submission been made on the question of retroactivity, and when it would apply?

Mr. WILSON: No. We have not had any interpretation of that as far as I can recall.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Are the decisions of the interpretation committee available in any place? Have they been printed?

Mr. MELVILLE: They are on the records of the commission. The committee of interpretation reports to the commission and then I bring the report before my colleagues at a general meeting of all the commissioners when there have been special recommendations they are adopted or they are not, and then they become part of the general practice.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Has any recommendation arrived at by this committee gone forward subsequently as an amendment to the Act?

Mr. MELVILLE: If at any time the commission in the course of its activities considers that there would be anything beneficial which might result through legislation it is put on a file I myself have, called "Pending legislation—Chairman's file" and I keep my minister fully informed. We do not always have to wait for veterans' organizations or other bodies to put forward improvements. I try to keep abreast of the situation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think these decisions should in some way be made available in the files of the commission. Should they not be brought to the attention of the public or the House of Commons so that we may know what is being done?

Mr. MELVILLE: If you wish to make an inquiry with regard to any particular section, I will be only too glad to advise you on that, Mr. Churchill. Mr. Wilson did mention one case of an A.R.P. worker. That case, in brief, was that he incurred an injury during the course of his employment as an A.R.P. worker in respect to which he received a pension according to a special schedule in the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. He died, and the pension award was over 50 per cent at the time of death on that special schedule, and the question was as to whether all the benefits of the Pension Act applied to his widow. The Veterans' Bureau acting on behalf of the widow presented their brief. It was heard by the Committee of Interpretation of my colleagues, and they recommended that the particular section apply so the widow was pensioned. I think that is the case Mr. Wilson referred to. That is just one special case, you see, which was referred.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Has the committee at any time made a decision concerning the interpretation of section 13, subsection 2?

Mr. MELVILLE: Well, section 13, subsection 2 has pretty well been in effect for years in the Act.

Mr. C. B. TOPP: Perhaps I could reply to that question, Mr. Churchill. We have an application for an interpretation of that particular section—an application in relation to peacetime service—pending at the present moment. I might add we find that cases arising out of peacetime service are perhaps the most complex of all those with which we have to deal at the present time. We hope by means of this application for interpretation to obtain a clear understanding of the attitude of the commission.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is another topic about which I wish to speak. I want to ask a question or two about the commissioners themselves without any reflection upon those learned and gallant gentlemen.

This arises out of the question I asked in the House last year at the time we were considering the estimates. I would like to pursue the thing a little further. I am not doing it in a critical sense, but it is in search of information. I note from the Act that there are no special qualifications required for commissioners, and I think we were told this morning that of the present number, four are doctors, four are lawyers and the others represent other occupations. I would like to know if each service is represented on these commissions; the navy, the army and the air force; how many of them had service in the first war, and how many in the second, and if any had service in both wars; also, in the event of army service for example, what corps they were with? I have two or three more questions along that line, but perhaps I should not put them all at once.

Mr. MELVILLE: I had better start with my list as I have it in front of me.

The chairman had service overseas in both wars with the corps of the Royal Canadian Engineers. The deputy chairman had service in both wars, and I think he was with the University battalion of Winnipeg, in World War I, and the Canadian Scottish in World War II.

An hon. MEMBER: Name please?

Mr. MELVILLE: L. A. Mutch. The next senior commissioner is O. B. F. Langelier, M.C., who had a gallant and distinguished record of service with an infantry battalion in World War I.

The fourth is Harry Bray, who had service, I believe, with a medical unit. He had good service in World War I, and long service as a pensions advocate.

H. A. Bridges, a lawyer and Rhodes scholar was a front line C.E.F. veteran.

J. R. Painchaud had very distinguished service in World War II with the infantry corps, and was a prisoner of war. A graduate in law.

Dr. J. F. Bates served in the ranks as a gunner in World War I. He returned from that war, entered university, and graduated in medicine. He has had a distinguished record in private practice, and was consulting surgeon at Camphill hospital. He served again in World War II on the staff of a general hospital overseas as a surgeon, and has an outstanding record in his profession.

Dr. J. P. Laplante, O.B.E., who also had a very distinguished record of service with the medical corps in World War II and medical administration.

Mr. Howard August, who served with the infantry, I think, in World War I. I believe he had some service in World War II, though I am not sure about that. A graduate in law.

Dr. W. L. Coke, O.B.E., was a graduate in medicine. He served with the permanent force for a number of years before World War II, and entered active service in World War II. He served throughout the entire period of that war and was director general of medical services for the Canadian army.

The next is Dr. Lawrence W. Brown of Ottawa who served with the medical corps. In fact, he was my medical officer when I commanded a militia unit between World War I and World War II. He went overseas with a field ambulance in World War II and had a long and distinguished record of very active service in that war. When he returned from service, and was retired, he was part-time and later full-time with the department, and was the consultant and chief of medicine at the veterans' pavilion in Ottawa.

The next one is J. M. Forman, D.F.C., who had an excellent record of service during World War II with the R.C.A.F. He was shot down and became a prisoner of war in occupied territory. Later he escaped and rendered very valuable service afterwards through his particular knowledge of unusual and abnormal conditions relating to prisoners of war.

The last one is Norman L. Pickersgill, who had naval service in World War I, and was active in the militia between wars. He had active naval service in the theatre of operations in World War II.

Therefore, in answer to another part of your question, Colonel Churchill, there is one representative of the senior service, the navy, there is one representative of the air force and the others represent the army. The great majority of them are the "P.B.I." and many served in the ranks, and then graduated to commissioned rank. They have all seen actual battle service.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much. I think that covers the questions I had in mind.

Mr. HELLYER: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted for the record, that that is a very distinguished group of commissioners and we are very proud and happy to have such a fine group serving as commissioners.

Mr. CHURCHILL: And they seem to cover all the possible fields of service both in the ranks and as officers which is one of the points I wanted to bring out in the course of the discussion.

Mr. MELVILLE: That has been very important on the appeal board and it establishes a very happy bridge between the applicant for pension and the three commissioners who constitute the board.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It is quite obvious that over 90 per cent of the applicants for pension must be from the ranks?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Just before you carry it, I want to ask one further question. Have those who were prisoners of war, let us say in Japan, practically all ended up as being on our pension roll?

Mr. MELVILLE: First of all, with regard to those who were prisoners of war in Japan, special instructions were given at the time of discharge, that they would be very closely questioned as to whether they incurred any disability during the period they were interned either in Japanese hands, or in German hands. If so, we were interested in knowing what treatment they received, and if they had any record of who gave them that treatment. Active inquiries were then pursued by the department following upon discharge. I think there were about 1,400 prisoners of war who were in Japanese hands, and who returned.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe it is 1,736.

Mr. MELVILLE: The minister points out to me from the statistics that there were 1,736 prisoners of war in Japan. Of these 1,418 were repatriated. Some of these men are still serving. Of those who returned, something like 95 per cent are in receipt of pensions or have pension entitlements, and there are a few of them with whom we have tried to get in contact on different occasions and they are not concerned. They are actively pursuing their civil vocations and have no concern or worry at the moment. There is an active organization known as the Hong Kong Prisoners of War Association which maintains close and friendly contact with the commission. Within the last 18 months we reviewed the file of every Hong Kong P.O.W. to make sure there was nothing lacking on his account, and if we had not heard, we endeavoured to establish communication with him. The department also arranged that following discharge, for a period of a few years, these men would be thoroughly examined so that records could be maintained and progress noted of any disabilities which might develop. We are also closely in touch with the United States and the United Kingdom, and we maintain an inter liaison for information

with respect to abnormal conditions and diseases which may have resulted from their unfortunate experiences when in P.O.W. camps in Japan.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. MACLEAN: There is one very brief question relating to what the brigadier had to say regarding the composition of the board. When an application comes from a member of one of the services, is an attempt made to have an examiner who served with that particular service sitting on the board considering the application?

Mr. MELVILLE: Not specifically, no, but I will say, Mr. MacLean, that if there is something peculiar about the claim with particular regard to air force service or regulations, or naval service or regulations, then the commissioner who had service with that particular branch of the service is brought into the discussion, very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item No 527.

> Pensions for Disability and Death, including pensions granted under the authority of the Civilian Government Employees (War) Compensation Order, P.C. 45/8848 of November 22, 1944, which shall be subject to the Pension Act; and including Newfoundland Special Awards, $129,784,500.

Details on page 626.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could have some information about the flying accidents compensation. I assume that is for these training accidents—is it compensation for that?

Mr. MELVILLE: I am very glad to answer your question, Mr. Cameron. I think in the year 1928 Canada first undertook air facilities for transportation of personnel engaged on governmental surveys. They were not travelling by schedule flights, so a special order in council was passed called the Flying Accidents Compensation Order. It made provision for members of the public service who were so engaged and who might meet with disability or death when carrying out that particular phase of their work. In the order in council their salary was related to certain ranks in the Pension Act so that the lower salary corresponded to the pension, shall I say, awarded to a lieutenant, and so on. That order in council has been modified on different occasions. Nothing has been taken away from it, but it has been modified and brought up to date and last year consideration was given—and I believe Mr. Minister a Bill is before the House—that it will be incorporated under the Government Employees Compensation Act so that that Act which makes provision for all government employees will take care of this group and they will no longer become the responsibility of the Canadian Pension Commission.

Mr. BRYCE: Does that take care of non-commissioned officers also?

Mr. MELVILLE: Civilian personnel.

Mr. BROOKS: What cases would be dealt with under burial grants and what cases would be dealt with under the last post-fund?

Mr. MELVILLE: There is a very excellent provision in the Pension Act. It is section 35, I think. The Act provides that when a pensioner pensioned on account of a disability dies and his estate is insufficient to meet the costs of his last illness and burial, the commission may make a grant. The sum total of that grant shall not exceed $185. Of that $185, $110 is payable for the cost of the funeral, $25 is payable towards cemetery charges. That makes $135. $50 may be paid towards last illness and burial. These are entirely separate

and apart from burials which may be carried out by the department when death occurs in a departmental institution. They are entirely separate from the last post fund.

Mr. BROOKS: Could not the same man come under the last post fund?

Mr. MELVILLE: He probably could qualify but this provision has always been in the act for disability pensioners and these funerals are generally carried out under the auspices of the family of the deceased and they are reimbursed to the amount provided in the statute.

Mr. BROOKS: There is no duplication?

Mr. MELVILLE: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in some information as to how the estimate for this commitment is arrived at. I notice there is a slight increase this year which does not concern me especially. What I am interested in is how the estimate for the payment of pensions in any one year is made, and finally if there are many occasions on which a supplementary estimate has to be required for that particular item?

Mr. MELVILLE: It is quite an intricate calculation. The commission reviews each month and in conjunction with the Chief Treasury Officer and Colonel Mace on my right here. We closely watch the trend of the pensions, the slow decrease in World War I, the increase in World War II the additional expenses which may be involved on account of retroactive awards, the additional expenses involved on account of readjustments which I mentioned such as in the case of defective hearing and so on, and by following that through month by month we are able to forecast and from that forecast we then arrive at the figure we consider to be the amount required for the next fiscal year. Sometimes we have to sell the Finance Department and Treasury Board on what we consider to be our estimates for the next fiscal year. It may be that we do not sell as strongly as we would like and a supplementary estimate may result. On the whole the amount which has been voted and the amount of expenditures for the fiscal year are amazingly close and for that I am indebted to the chief treasury officer and those who work with me and the Director of Finance in the department.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not wish to be critical, but it seems to be a bit unfortunate that that happens. If I understood the brigadier properly it seems to me that under those circumstances that there might, since people are human, be a tendency to make the pattern fit the cloth. However, if it is found for some unforeseen reason that there are a lot of applications coming in in the year before, the commission may perhaps unconsciously feel we are getting a little too generous and are going to overspend our allotment. I think it should be remembered that this commitment to the veterans is a statutory one and that parliament is committed before hand to provide whatever amount is required by the Pensions Commission in a normal carrying out of their duties.

This is an extreme situation and I use it only to illustrate, but supposing in a given year it was found for some unforeseen reason there were a large number of favourable decisions made resulting in an over expenditure of several million dollars, I think that it would seem to me that the government is already committed to provide those funds and that the commission should not be inhibited in any way unconsciously towards living within the estimate which has been approved for the fiscal year.

Mr. MELVILLE: May I say that the commission has no inhibitions—none—because we administer the Pension Act and that Act in section 5 states that the commission shall have full and unrestricted power and authority and exclusive jurisdiction, to deal with and adjudicate upon all matters relating to the award, increase, decrease or cancellation of any pension under this Act.

I have been connected with veterans affairs since the day I was discharged in World War I and never at any time have I found any question or difficulty in that respect with any government. We had no difficulty last year. I thought the pencil was pretty sharp last year when the amount was provided and I had the feeling we would not have sufficient money and we did have to ask for a supplementary and there was no difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN: Last year I believe you spent about $900,000 more than the estimate, did you not?

Mr. MELVILLE: $865,000.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The question is not unfair that Mr. MacLean asked because if you look back at the records up until 1948 there was a substantial increase in the basic rates and there appears to have been a certain pattern established. You take the figures from 1928 to 1948 for World War I and find in 1928 there were 50,635 pensions in force and in 1948 that number was 69,390. The annual liability in 1928—I will just give it in round figures,—was 24 million, and in 1948 it was 25 million and if you look at the intervening years although the number of pensioners is 80,000 the annual liabilities went up to 30 million. Over a period of 20 years there seems to have been a pattern established that pensions would not go beyond a certain sum. It always struck me as odd that there should not have been a sharp rise in the number of pensioners and the liability. The figures from 1948 on I have not examined because some of them I did not have available. There was a change in pension rates and they are not comparable to those earlier ones. But it just may be that one might wonder whether there has been anything in the nature of a pattern established. We have your assurance now that there is no inhibition and no restraint by the Treasury Board or anything of that nature.

Mr. MELVILLE: There is not pattern the figures you quote are for WWI and declined after 1940. The Canadian Pension Commission is the guardian of the rights and benefits which Canada provides for all those veterans who were disabled in the service of their country and for the dependents of those who died. That is our solemn duty and no one has ever at any time interfered with the commission in the discharge of that obligation.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is one other question in respect to automatic increases of pensions which I am not clear on. Could we have an explanation? Is there an automatic increase by reason of age?

Mr. MELVILLE: There is a section of the Act 28, which requires the commission to prepare a table of disabilities. That table of disabilities is a guide for medical examiners in the districts and others in arriving at the assessment of the degree of disability. For instance, amputation at the shoulder is 80 per cent and so on. In 1938, following a great deal of consideration, it was decided that the disability imposed, particularly in the case of amputation cases, became much more severe with advancing years. A man might have 70 per cent for a thigh amputation and in the immediate years following World War I that was not too bad, but when he came to a much higher age bracket and probably with the limitation of exercise the disability imposed a greater handicap. It was difficult to arrive at that handicap because what might apply to one individual might not apply to another and there was a desire to be fair because all those had suffered major disabilities. The upshot of that was that it was decided to amend the Table and provide in amputation cases and those suffering from serious gunshot wounds, which were assessed at 50 per cent or more so that when they attained the age of 55 years they would be entitled to an automatic increase of 10 per cent. That is, if he is a 50 per cent pensioner he would automatically have his award

increased to 60 per cent. If he was a 60 per cent pensioner he would automatically be increased to 70 per cent; and if he was a 70 per cent pensioner he was automatically increased to 80 per cent. At the age of 57 he was entitled to another automatic age increase of 10 per cent. The one who had gone to 60 could now go to 70, the one who had gone to 70 could now go to 80 but then had reached his peak. The 50 per cent amputation case or gunshot wound case could reach a maximum of 80 per cent, as could the 60 or 70 per cent. That was restricted to amputation and gunshot wound cases.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is no automatic increase from 80 to 100 per cent?

Mr. MELVILLE: No.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): I would like to have some explanation of the item "special grants". What are they?

Mr. MELVILLE: In the deliberations which led up to the union of Newfoundland with Canada, one of the big problems was that of the former members of the forces. When the agreement went into effect Canada did accept the responsibility for paying certain awards for which there was no corresponding provision in Canadian legislation, but for which there was no responsibility on the Newfoundland government at the time of union, the 1st of April, 1949. One example of that was merchant seamen of World War I. There was no provision in a Canadian statute for these, but Newfoundland had a provision so we took the liability that existed at the time of union. And there were a few other cases wherein, as I say, there was no legislation either in the Pensions Act or in the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. We have continued, and a special appropriation was set up, and the commission has paid benefits out of that appropriation. That is why they are still carried on and provided for in the estimates.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): Would members of the Tug Boat Assistance Fund which existed in Newfoundland in the second war get any benefits?

Mr. MELVILLE: Not unless they were recipients of awards by the Newfoundland Board of Pension Commissioners at the date of the union.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): The date of union followed closely the cessation of hostilities. I know that these people were urging that some recommendation be given to them. I do not know too much about it. They were a disciplined force although they were in receipt of pay which was the equivalent to the ordinary merchant marine pay. They were certainly operating in a very, very dangerous service. One boat was torpedoed and the entire crew was lost. I do know that at home there is a feeling that these people are not being generously treated. It was a fairly large force, I believe.

Mr. MELVILLE: If they come within the provisions which existed in Canada under similar circumstances then would be provided for in the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. We would deal with them provided they meet the requirements of that statute.

Mr. POWER (*St. John's West*): I do not think they do.

Mr. MACLEAN: Part of this item has to do with peacetime services. I notice there is a slight increase, but that has nothing to do with the increase about which I am going to comment. Brigadier Melville referred to the difficulty of determining whether or not a man who died or who was killed was a member of a peacetime service, and as such whether he had an entitlement or not, or at least whether his widow had an entitlement or not. It seems to me that there is a great deal of misunderstanding especially on the part of widows of peacetime servicemen as to what their benefits may be, if their husbands happened to be killed accidentally.

My experience has been that when a serviceman is killed on leave, or when completely away from his duties and so on, his widow first acts on the assumption that she will be pensionable because no doubt that was the case when the men were on active service. I know this is not directly the responsibility of the Minister of Veterans Affairs possibly, but I hope that very careful consideration might be given by the minister along with his colleague, the Minister of National Defence whose prime responsibility it would be, I presume, to provide perhaps some group insurance scheme or some means of having some benefit accrue to the widows of peacetime servicemen who are killed off duty.

I know there are many cases where young men go into service and let their life insurance lapse because they are under the impression that they are completely covered and then they get themselves killed off duty and their widows are left completely destitute. There are some most pathetic cases in existence in regard to this. I just wondered in regard to that special group of dependents if their plight has been given any special consideration by either this department or the Department of National Defence.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As you pointed out, this is primarily the responsibility of the Department of National Defence. I would like to remind you that there does exist the Defence Services Pension Act and that every man serving in the regular forces in either of the three services qualifies under the Defence Services Pensions Act. If he is killed or dies while on peacetime service, his widow or dependents may draw the benefits which exist under that Act. Of course if a man has but a very limited period of service, then the benefits are also limited because it is a contributory pension scheme, the same as the superannuation Act, I would say.

Mr. MACLEAN: His widow would only draw, roughly, the contributions which have been made for his pension.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It depends on his length of service, I am not familiar with the details of that particular Act, but as far as I recall, a man has to have served a minimum number of years before he qualifies for a pension or before his widow qualifies for a pension after his death. If he serves less than that, then she gets a gratuity; or he might get a gratuity if he should retire before having served for that period of time, and the amount of gratuity again would vary according to his length of service.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, it would be dependent on the contribution he himself made.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am thinking chiefly of a large number of young fellows who joined the services for three years only and who do not accumulate any worthwhile fund in their service pension fund during that time. I know of cases of young servicemen who have been killed while not on duty during their fist or second year in the service. That leaves their widows practically destitute.

Mr. WESELAK: The armed services have available the same insurance plan as the civil service, and at a very reasonable cost.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I think so.

Mr. MELVILLE: The commission agrees with your remarks about members of the forces being informed. By personal representation to the Adjutant General and by correspondence with the Deputy Minister we have kept it constantly before the Department of National Defence. We believe that all three services are fully informed. It has been promulgated again and again. The distinction between awards under the Pension Act and awards under the Defence Services Pensions Act has been made clear.

The CHAIRMAN: When people join the army they are urged very strongly to take out insurance. I know when my own son joined they put pressure on him to take out insurance although he was only seventeen years of age and there was no particular reason for it. They put up a very strong case to him to take out insurance, so I take it that is the policy of the department.

Mr. MACLEAN: I hope it is and I am very pleased with that information. What I had in mind, as you probably guessed, was something similar to the insurance scheme which I believe they have for the United States forces, where the man is insured from the very day he joins to the extent of $10,000; and if he is killed immediately then his widow is the beneficiary.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and the premium is retained from his pay. It is compulsory insurance.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is right. I was not visualizing something which was completely free or anything of that sort.

Mr. MCLEOD: You have that same service for the Canadian forces.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but it is not compulsory. I believe in the American service it existed during the war and it was compulsory. The man, upon enlistment, was given an insurance policy covering his life for a stated amount, and whether he liked it or not, he held that policy and the premiums were retained from his pay. That is my understanding of how it worked.

Mr. MACLEAN: It would seem to me that if a system of that sort, or something of that nature were set up, it would simplify the task of the Pension Commission considerably because it would remove from them the onus of having to deal with widows of service men who try to establish claims on very slim evidence, and under very pathetic circumstances. That is all I had in mind.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does not Mr. MacLean's problem relate also to this controversial section 13, subsection 2, where the responsibiilty of this department is indicated. He mentioned the fact that there is a division of responsibility. The Department of National Defence and the Department of Veterans Affairs have a responsibility under that particular section.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: If death is incurred in service; but if a man coming out of Cartier Square should get run over by a bus on the street while not on duty surely it is not the responsibility of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which has to deal with problems of veterans who have incurred disabilities on operations and on duty.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Suppose the man was going on a message.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Then it would be up to the Department of National Defence. A court of inquiry would be held. The pension commission would take into consideration the decision, and the result of that court of inquiry, and if it was established that the man was on duty, then undoubtedly his widow would be pensioned.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Has Brigadier Melville got the figures on the question I asked earlier about the number of applications under that which have been refused?

Mr. MELVILLE: Not yet. I telephoned the office at the noon hour to inquire about the records. They are available, but it will take a little time. However, I will be able to get them for you.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In view of the discussion on this point I think that the Department of Veterans Affairs might very well give very close attention to this particular section 13, subsection 2. Earlier we heard it stated that the interpretation of the last phrase in that clause is going to be arrived at by the interpretation committee. But the problem seems to be getting greater

as the years go by with an increase in the forces. There has to be an application to one particular case, and I may say that the Veterans' Bureau in presenting this to the interpretation committee has in mind the features of a particular claim.

Mr. TOPP: Yes Mr. Chairman. The question really turns upon what is the meaning of "directly arising out of military service". The commission has in some cases granted entitlement under that section in respect of poliomelitis because a member of the forces was posted to a station where that disease happened to be unusually prevalent at a given time. It has also granted entitlement in respect of a member of the forces who was engaged in a regimental hockey game on the basis that he had a duty to participate in that contest as a member of his unit. That man, I may say, had a heart attack and died. There are innumerable other cases of that type and yet, from our point of view as pensions advocates we have been unable to arrive at any clear understanding of precisely what the requirements of the commission are in the application of that section to peacetime military service. We will, as the chairman of the commission has intimated, base our application and our arguments upon some specific case—perhaps on more than one case. That is part of the requirements laid down by the commission itself permitting us to appear in such issues. But we hope that by this means some clearer picture will emerge. At the moment we have one of our advocates examining every case over a period of years in which entitlement has been granted or refused under section 13 (2) and the basis of our submission to the committee on the interpretation issue will be determined in the light of the conclusions we arrive at following that study.

Mr. BROOKS: What proportion of the applications made under section 13 (2) are granted?

Mr. MELVILLE: I do not know that I have that figure available. I doubt it.

Mr. BROOKS: Would it be 50 per cent?

Mr. MELVILLE: I would not like to guess at it, but as I say, I could get the figure for you.

Mr. BROOKS: I thought that perhaps from your wide experience you might know.

Mr. MELVILLE: My experience is fairly wide, but I would not like to quote any figure until sure of my ground.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we carry this item?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 528:

Gallantry Awards World War II and Special Forces—$19,500.

Mr. MACLEAN: Am I correct in assuming that in the case of these awards in respect of the First World War the United Kingdom government carries the responsibility.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: One very small point: I noticed in the Public Accounts for 1954 there is a list of the awards for which this is granted.

The CHAIRMAN: What page is that on Mr. MacLean?

Mr. MACLEAN: Page ZZ16. I am under the impression that these awards are made only to non-commissioned ranks. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That is correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: In the Public Accounts the Distinguished Flying Cross is included in the awards. I take it that must be a misprint?

Mr. MELVILLE: That is not so Mr. MacLean. A Warrant Officer may be awarded a Military Cross and a Distinguished Flying Cross may also be awarded. He may eventually be promoted to commissioned rank but the decoration could be awarded to him while he was still a Warrant Officer.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not think that the Military Cross is listed.

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes. Shall I read them? This vote provides for the payment of pecuniary benefits to members of the forces—other ranks—of World War II and of the Canadian Special Force who have been awarded the Victoria Cross, the Military Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Distinguished Conduct Medal, the Conspicuous Gallantry Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Military Medal and the Distinguished Flying Medal in respect of gallantry in service in a theatre of operations.

Payment is on the basis of a gratuity of $100 or 12½ cents a day in lieu thereof if the recipient of the gallantry award is a disability pensioner. In so far as "other-rank" recipients of the Victoia Cross are concerned a $50 annuity is payable and in addition an amount of 12½ cents a day in the case of a pensioner.

The CHAIRMAN: I see they have left the Military Cross out of the estimates.

Mr. MACLEAN: Would it not apply to the D.S.C. as well?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I do not think that the D.S.C. is given to Petty Officers or ratings, whereas the D.F.C. and M.C. may be given to Warrant Officers.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that item carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Before Brigadier Melville and Brigadier Topp leave this committee I think we should say that we have appreciated very much the evidence which they have given and the help which they have been to the committee.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MELVILLE: May I say, gentlemen, that is mutual and I shall be glad to convey to my colleagues the gist of your discussion and remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: This brings us to item 529:

> To provide for the cost of administration of Veterans' Land Act; Soldier Settlement and British Family Settlement—$4,998,508.00.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bryce, will you ask the first questions?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Bryce would permit me to intervene here. As members of the committee see, the director of the Veterans' Land Act had a precis prepared with regard to the operations of his directorate during the last fiscal year and I think it will be found to be a pretty comprehensive survey. The director, if it is agreeable to the committee, would like to go through this precis—or at least through the first pages, which are not very long—before questions are asked, if that is agreeable to you.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is a good idea and that the committee should follow the suggestion of the minister, which is one which might save a lot of time.

Mr. T. J. RUTHERFORD (*Director, Veterans' Land Act*): Mr. Chairman, this deals largely with our organizations and functions, and will bring the committee up to date with regard to some of our more important activities during the past year.

The Veterans' Land Act Administration functions through 257 permanent field areas, each the responsibility of a resident field supervisor. These, together

with 93 construction supervisors, constitute our front-line. They are the grass-roots administrators on whose ability and effort so much of the success of our work depends.

Each field supervisor works out of an office situated either in his own home or in a public building, if there is one centrally located in his territory. Although the workload is approximately the same in each field, they vary considerably as to the number and nature of accounts, the average being about 235 with a public investment of about one and a quarter million dollars. Construction supervisors look after an average of about 20 active contracts.

Field supervisors are held primarily responsible for sound appraisals of properties for purchase, for the selection and purchase of stock and equipment, for the maintenance of the director's security, and for the getting in of all payments as and when due. This is one of our most important functions. If we buy farm property on the basis of its productive value the veteran is half-way towards repaying his loan. I believe it is one of our most important functions as it gets our settlers off to a good start. Field supervisors are also required to use every effort to assure the success of all settlers in their field in order to carry out the principal intent of the Act, which is successful rehabilitation of veterans and the return to the public treasury of all money due.

In order to assure that this all-important front-line work will be done effectively, field supervisors were carefully selected in the first instance from successful farmer veterans with, whenever possible, a degree in agriculture and they receive continuing on-the-job training in matters having to do with rural appraisal, the organization and management of farm enterprises, and up-to-date agricultural and horticultural practices.

The administration's policy is to keep its field and construction supervisors so well informed and so up to date that their service and advice, when needed as they so often are, will be sought by the veteran rather than imposed of necessity in order to prevent failure or loss. This policy has helped to create a relationship between veterans and supervisors which has done much to accomplish our objective of "collections without tears" by creating not only the ability to pay but also the will to pay, based on the settler's own self-interest and his desire to help his supervisor.

V.L.A. fields are grouped on a geographical rather than numerical basis into 34 regions. Each region has a supervisor who exercises general supervision over the work and on-the-job training of the field staff within his region. Together with the regional advisory committee, of which he is the chairman, he is responsible for the qualification of veterans and for recommending land purchases based on the field supervisor's appraisal. He is also responible for the checking and contol of field supervisors' expenses and for rating each settler's progress based on field supervisors' reports. He also lends a hand with problem cases whenever they arise.

The regions are grouped into eight districts: one for the maritimes and Newfoundland; two for Ontario; and one for each of the other provinces. The work at district level, and similarly at head office, is carried out in five functional divisions: an administration and secretarial division; a supervision and collection division; a property division; a securities division, with which is associated a legal section; and a construction division.

Extent and Permanency of Settlement

As of April 10, 1955, 31,314 veterans had been assisted to settle as full-time farmers; 35,046 as small holders; and 994 as commercial fisherman; or 67,354 in all, excluding 1,456 Indian veterans settled on reserves who are looked after by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Of those originally settled, 4,043 have repaid their indebtedness and taken title; 2,924 have assigned their agreements to other veterans; 1,631 have given quit claim deeds back to the director; and 428 have vacated Crown lands on which they were settled. Of those in the two latter classes some were potential failures but many others left for reasons beyond their control. Out of the 67,354 established, only 126, or less than one out of every 500, have had to be put off their property for non-compliance with their agreement. All considered, it may be said that there has been very much more permanency of tenure among veterans settled under V.L.A. than is normal among property owners generally.

There remained on our books at April 10, 1955, 58,605 active V.L.A. accounts and 115 active soldier settlement accounts. There are only 50 of the soldier settlement accounts that have not been adjusted.

In addition to this, we had 2,332 civilian purchaser accounts mostly of reverted soldier settlement properties, making 61,052 active accounts as of April 10.

This figure includes about two or three hundred project properties. Since the figures I am giving you are those we use in our operational control, rather than statistical figures, there is a slight variation, but only a few hundred. To this extent it may vary from the statistical statement when issued for the end of the fiscal year.

Value of Investment

The original cost of all property now held for veterans under the Veterans' Land Act was $326,000,000. Its present-day value would be well over $500,000,000. Fire insurance coverage alone is over $320,000,000. V.L.A. farms average 198 acres, and small holdings 6 acres. Excluding all small holdings on subdivisions—which, generally speaking are quite small—V.L.A. holds title to about one out of every thirteen agricultural units in Canada having a gross income of $1,200 or over.

Progress of Settlers

While many farm settlers are still having a struggle to transform their properties into sound economic farm units, many others have already received or passed this very important objective. The extra $3,000 now available at 5 per cent under Part III of the Act is proving to be particularly helpful in overcoming this hurdle. This additional loan has come at a time when prices are more stable than they were, and at a time when both the settler and his Supervisor know how to invest it to better advantage.

The success and progress of V.L.A. farm settlers is best reflected in their excellent payment record and in the small number of rescinded contracts. Scarcely a week passes that the press somewhere in Canada does not carry a feature article relating a success story of a V.L.A. farmer or giving an account of some innovation which a V.L.A. farmer has started on his farm and which is proving sufficiently successful to receive recognition.

As a result of a cross-section check made at the begining of last year, it was estimated that the annual income derived by small holders from their properties was then around $6,500,000. This production is increasing every year and could be greatly expanded in any period of reduced employment. A number who started as small holders are now deriving all or the greatest part of their income from their land and may be considered as full-time farmers.

Collections

In spite of a 30 per cent drop in farm income over the past few years and an almost complete crop failure over large areas of the West last season, less than 1½ per cent of all our settlers are behind in their payments as much as

$200 in the case of farmers or $100 in the case of small holders, and of these, 87 per cent are in the prairie provinces where their inability to pay is almost entirely due to crop failure.

I might say that in the province of Quebec, there is only one who is behind in his payment to that extent and there are only five in British Columbia. I will deal with this later but I wish to stress that there are very few in special arrears except as a result of crop failure.

As of March 31, 1955, in spite of some unemployment, only 42 out of over 30,000 small holders were $100 or more behind in their payments. Taking prepayments into consideration, V.L.A. has collected 110 per cent of all money due and owing to date.

Construction

The "Build Your Own Home" program together with the construction courses that form part of it, was instituted to meet the problem of ever-increasing construction costs which were making it impossible for many needy veterans to take advantage of the small holding provisions of the Act. Out of 17,800 houses completed since the inception of the Act, 10,586 have been built by veterans acting as their own contractors; this program started officially in 1950 and out of a total of 2,052 houses presently under construction, 1,896, or 92%, are being built by the veterans themselves.

This figure is almost but not entirely correct because while it is true that 92 per cent of the houses presently under construction are being built by veteran-contractors, construction runs over from one year to the next. The time required for a veteran-contractor to build a house is generally from 14 to 16 months.

The saving already effected in contractors' profit alone, figured at $1,000 per house, would be over $12,000,000. An even larger amount by way of "sweat equity" has probably been saved through veterans using their own labour.

During the past winter V.L.A., with the assistance of the Canadian Legion, boards of education and others, has conducted 119 construction schools with a total registration of 3,385.

Part II Construction

Owing to the late spring,—and the necessity for staff training—only 30 houses are presently under construction under part II. However, the construction division's estimate is that about 825 houses will be commenced under the provisions of part II this year. The demand for part-time farming settlement still continues strong and we expect to commence another 1,550 houses on small holdings during the year, making 2,375 commencements in all. Since construction time under the "Build Your Own Home" program averages from fourteen to sixteen months, the number under construction is always in excess of the number of starts for the year. This would mean about 3,000 to supervise or about 32 per supervisor. Distributed as they are, this is considered to be a heavy workload.

Part III Loans

The new part III, which, under certain conditions, permits a 50 per cent increase in loans made to farmer settlers on a 5 per cent fully repayable basis, places considerable extra responsibility on Field Supervisors, since it is largely on their good judgment and recommendation that additional loans will be granted or refused at higher level. It is their responsibility to recommend as to whether the veteran's plan for expenditure of the loan will add equivalent value to the property and increase its productive potential to an extent which

will make the loan a good investment both from the standpoint of the veteran and the public, and in all cases to assist the veteran to invest the money to the best advantage.

Probably this is the most important part of our work.

To date, we have approved 533 Part III loans to farmers, and about 1,434 small holding veterans settled during the past eight months have taken advantage of all or part of the additional $1,400 made available to them at the time of contract.

Trends in Settlement

There was a considerable falling off in settlement during the first eight months of 1954, which we believe was due to rumours of proposed changes in V.L.A. legislation. This trend has now been completely reversed, so much so that during the past five months (November-March) we have invested $2,800,000 more than in the same period last year.

While V.L.A. settlement has continued on a fairly even keel during the past six years, the workload continues to increase since much of it is cumulative with the ever-increasing number of active accounts. However, in spite of this we have been able to reduce staff by about 40 per cent during this period.

I might say that in 1946, our staff was 1,860; in 1947, 1,704; in 1950 it had dropped to 1,360; and today we have a staff of only 1,082.

This has been possible because of more experience, better training and better organization. We hope to be able to take in our stride the greater part of the additional work resulting from parts II and III of the Act. Although provision has been made in the estimates for 31 additional construction supervisors, every effort is being made to get along with present staff until we are sure of the extent to which the new legislation is going to permanently increase our workload. The other small increases in our staff estimates are for the upgrading of a few people we could ill-afford to lose and whose experience and training make them particularly valuable in the mortgage and construction fields, where salaries for similar work are very much higher than we are paying.

Travel and Collection Methods

Travel has always been, and will continue to be, a large and very necessary item in our administrative costs. However, despite an increased workload and higher car operating costs, by improving work organization we have been able to keep this item at approximately the same level from year to year.

I might say that in 1951-52, it was $475,000; in 1952-53, $493,000; 1953-54, $473,000 and in 1954-55, $485,000. We have 117 government-owned cars and 330 of our staff drive their own cars.

Very considerable economy has been effected by our insistence that our field supervisors live centrally in their fields.

You will understand, Mr. Chairman, that this is not entirely a matter of economy. We believe it is important that the supervisor who looks after a settler, who helps him to buy his livestock, who is responsible for getting in the payments, and for ensuring his success, should be acquainted with the community and with the settler's problems. Much of the success we enjoy is because our field staff have a close and intimate relationship and association with their clients.

We have also saved a great deal of time and expense by arranging to have our small holding settlers make their payments by supplying us with a book of twelve post-dated cheques at the beginning of each year. We started this system only three years ago and at the present time over 12,000 small holding settlers are paying $2,500,000 annually in this very convenient way. An additional 5,800 are paying by pension or salary assignment,—and I would like to say here that Brigadier Melville has been very helpful and cooperative

in this respect—we also have 1,222 paying by crop share agreement. These automatic payments greatly reduce travel and postage costs and give our Field Supervisors additional time for more constructive work.

During the last twelve months, V.L.A. supervisors have made 2,240 investigations for other branches of the department, and 1,828 for other government departments; many of the latter being land appraisals, often involving several days work.

No review of V.L.A. work, however short, would be complete without drawing attention to the part played by the settlers themselves. They have shown a marked appreciation of what Canada has done for them and, with very few exceptions, have responded by putting forward a most creditable effort and by giving our administration the kind of cooperation and encouragement which makes our work pleasant and rewarding.

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask how many of the old soldier settlers are still on the books, but it is 115. Could you tell the committee how much these 115 men owe the government?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: As of this date they owe us $76,552.45, or an average of $665.67.

Mr. BRYCE: Could you tell me what it takes to administer that $76,000 debt?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is not only these. We have about 1,400 accounts of civilian purchasers of soldier settlement land and they are all looked after together.

Mr. BRYCE: I have been under the impression they should be wiped out, but I do not get everyone to agree with me.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Of this 115, 65 have had their accounts adjusted and are paying on a time basis. Instead of having to pay the whole amount at the time of the adjustment, we have given time to those who didn't have the money to pay. These 65 are in that position. 17 of the other 50 are not eligible, in that they are not soldier settlers or soldiers widows. Most of these 17 properties are held in soldier's estates. 13 are eligible but wish to pay in full. In Quebec none of the soldier settlers accepted the reduction.

Mr. BRYCE: Why is the record in Quebec so good?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Personal supervision of the minister and the example given as a land settler himself.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The esprit de corps is good down there. There are 12 eligible who do not qualify under the provisions of the order-in-council, since they are well-to-do people. There are 8 who are eligible for reduction but as yet we have not been able to negotiate with them.

Mr. BRYCE: If they are so well off why have they not paid before?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They are happy to get a loan at 3½ per cent. It is a good investment. Some do not want title for various reasons.

Mr. BRYCE: I am not going to debate the thing, but I still think a benevolent country could wipe that off and let them go scot-free. They all came about the same time I did and if they have been paying all that time they have paid a lot of interest to the government.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: And they have had many reductions since that time.

Mr. BRYCE: You gave the one in British Columbia and in Quebec where they had crops, but what about the prairie provinces where they had no crops?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Those figures had to do with full time farmers and the number of these who owe us $200 or more. In British Columbia out of 1,450 there are 3, in Alberta out of 4,949 there are 217, in Saskatchewan out of 6,476 there are 329—that is a big rise since last year. Saskatchewan collections have

been very good, but as you know there are large areas in Saskatchewan where they had no crop this year. In Manitoba, out of 3,713 farmers there are 171; in western Ontario out of 2,372 there are 16, in eastern Ontario out of 2,025 there are 12, in Quebec out of 954 there is 1, in the maritimes out of 2,123 there are 39. I might say that 23 of the 39 are in two very small areas in New Brunswick around Perth and Woodstock.

As to small holdings, in British Columbia there are 6,448 and 5 who owe us $100. In Alberta there are 1,358 small holdings and two who owe us $100. There are 633 in Saskatchewan of which there is none in arrears. There are 1,566 in Manitoba with one in arrears; 6,733 in western Ontario and 15 in arrears; 7,105 in eastern Ontario and 12 in arrears; 2,560 in Quebec and none in arrears. 3,611 in the maritimes with 7 in arrears. That makes a total for all districts of 42 in arrears of over $100.

Mr. McLEOD: In connection with these older settlers I was very much in sympathy with Mr. Bryce, however, I had a letter from one of these original settlers in the province of Saskatchewan—I do not know why he wrote to me —and he was apparently one of these cases where an adjustment had been made and he had a payment to meet on the 1st of April this year and because of his absolute crop failure he would be unable to meet the payment and was quite worried about it. Is there any special consideration being given to Saskatchewan this year?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes. We are not pressing anyone who cannot pay. Our job is to help make them able to pay and to see that they do pay when able.

Mr. McLEOD: He was concerned about the fact that if he did not make this payment he would revert to the old terms of the agreement.

M. RUTHERFORD: Yes, but I do not think that will happen. I shouldn't say it out loud, but we are making very good arrangements with these people in cases of crop failure.

Mr. McLEOD: I wrote and told the gentleman that I thought it would be looked after.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. MacLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think we are indebted to Brigadier Rutherford for this very complete report. I think I am correct in saying that the Veterans Land Act is about the only veterans legislation in which the benefits receivable are not proportionate to the service of the men concerned. Now I am wondering if there is a tendency, and if you have any figures as to what percentage of the veterans settled under the Veterans Land Act would be qualified for only a small amount of re-establishment credit or what percentage would be qualified for a large percentage? What I am trying to get at is this: there are veterans who had long service overseas and a very considerable amount of reestablishment credit or university training and the like due to them. Has there been a tendency for the legislation to fail to attract these people back to the land? Is there a tendency for them to go off to university, or has there been a tendency for them to go off and take university benefits instead and establish themselves in some other industry rather than going back to the farm and even going back to the farm but not settling under the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I do not think that is a fact, but we haven't figures since we have nothing directly to do with the war service grants. We could have obtained a picture along the lines you mentioned but we haven't done so. Our observation is that it has not made a great deal of difference. The Veterans' Land Act benefits are always better than re-establishment credit, and university training is better still insofar as direct benefits are concerned.

Mr. MacLEAN: My experience has been that some veterans although very satisfied with the Veterans Land Act as such and its administration, feel that

it is a bit unfair for a fellow who has been overseas for 5 years to have to forfeit his gratuities or benefits in any other field in order to qualify for benefits under the Veterans Land Act, whereas his neighbour next door who was in the service for only one year here in Canada perhaps, or it does not matter where, but his neighbour next door has the minimum qualification and he gets exactly the same benefit under the Veterans Land Act. I know some veterans feel there should be some recognition to the length and kind of service. One thing suggested to me was a veteran settling under the Veterans Land Act should only have to forfeit a certain percentage of his re-establishment credit and that he should be able to retain at least a token amount of his other re-establishment credit so that his service would be recognized even in a token way.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I do not know it as a fact, but I understand that part 2 of the War Service Grants Act was passed after the Rehabilitation Act and the Veterans Land Act, and that it was passed to provide for those who were not taking the Veterans Land Act or university training benefits. It is an alternative benefit for those who were not taking one of the others. That is what I have been told and I have also read some of the committee reports at the time which gave me that impression .

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, I believe that is correct and I recognize that problem. But nevertheless the fact remains that veterans who settle under the Veterans Land Act who have great variation in the length of service, resent, or at least the ones with great length of service, resent the fact that they are put in the same bundle and under the other benefits they are not and the length of service whether overseas or not, is taken into account.

Mr. WESELAK: Am I correct in assuming that a veteran of 5 years can apply his whole re-establishment credit on his settlement account?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: He does not draw his re-establishment credit. But I would think that the man who has served say 5 years overseas probably would bring about the highest re-establishment credit and that his credit would hardly be more than the conditional grant he gets under the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. MACLEAN: They do not have title to their property when they take benefit under the Veterans Land Act. They would be almost as well off not to settle under the Veterans Land Act and take their re-establishment and have a clear title to the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: But they are not as well off.

Mr. MACLEAN: I know, but they have clear title if they take the re-establishment, and I know veterans who are in that category who have been overseas 4 or 5 years, and they admit that they have obtained the greatest benefit by settling under the Veterans Land Act. Nevertheless they resent the fact that they have to forfeit a large amount of other benefits in order to qualify, whereas their neighbour who has little or no benefits in other fields also qualifies for the full amount of benefits under the Veterans Land Act. It has been suggested to me by veterans in that category that perhaps at least some token recognition of their position should be made. One suggestion was that a veteran settling under the Veterans Land Act should at least be entitled to retain a token percentage of his re-establishment credits.

Mr. RUTHEFORD: That does not come under the Veterans Land Act but under War Service Grants Act. It has nothing to do with the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. MACLEAN: I realize that. I was just pointing it out.

Mr. ENFIELD: Might I ask Brigadier Rutherford how we are doing under part two, where the veteran is assisted in constructing his own home on a lot approved by C.M.H.C.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Would you give the figures on that.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: As I said before, there are 30 who have commenced construction under part two of the Act. There is a total of 101 applications being processed at the moment, and the average contract price is $8,895.

During last winter we held 119 construction schools in different parts of Canada. We had an attendance of 3,385. 806 of those attending have indicated a desire to build under part two, and 1,012 under parts 1 and 3.

We have a very good working arrangement with C.M.H.C. and are getting along very well with them in our negotiations. They have been quite helpful. They laid down three different classes in which to clasify the loans. They are allowing fairly generous deletions. In fact, Colonel Griffith told me that according to the last communication he had, they are going to allow certain exceptions or deletions in all three classes of contract. This permits veterans who build their own houses to omit certain things to be completed later. I understand that they will only require one bedroom to be finished. The closet and cupboard doors may be left off. The interior decoration, except for the kitchen and dining room, may be omitted, and the topsoil may be omitted from the grading outside. And besides that, those who are in the low income groups and who may not be able to finance a loan as high as $8,000 may be permitted other deletions as well. We are getting on very well in keeping down the amount of paper work. It is very satisfactory.

The veteran can live in the house and complete it over a period of maybe two or three years. We do this now under the Veterans' Land Act part 7, and it works out very well. We have similar deletions to those being allowed by C.M.H.C.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have another question. I have received inquiries from time to time and I have referred them to the nearest settlement officer. One was a case of which I suppose there are many, where the man applied for settlement under the Veterans' Land Act. He was married to a veteran. Both the couple were veterans, and individually they might qualify for settlement. Now, in that case where the man has a high establishment credit and his wife has a low one, can the business be done in her name?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, very definitely, sir. That is being done all the time. In fact, even after they are settled we will transfer the agreement from one to the other. A good many veterans have acquired property and we have transferred the title to the wives.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is no provision for allowing both?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, there is not. They are considered as one entity.

Mr. MACLEAN: You cannot have a double establishment when both are qualified?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You cannot build a duplex.

Mr. BRYCE: With a door in between?

Mr. MACLEAN: Is it possible for a veteran who would qualify for settlement under the Veterans' Land Act, and who also has a home which he owns, to establish a farm without having a home on it under the Veterans' Land Act at all?

The CHAIRMAN: How long will it take you to answer that question?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, go ahead.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Farming is a business. On the prairies we may have farmer settlers who live in the city and who operate a farm outside. That is quite permissible. But it is not permissible to live away from a small holding because it is essentially a place to live. However, a farm is not necessarily such.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now adjourn until 3:30 tomorrow afternoon in this room.

APPENDIX "E"

FIRST AND INITIAL HEARINGS

DISABILITY PENSION APPLICATIONS

World War I	Ex-Members			Supp. Pensions			Total		
First Hearing	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total
1.4.50 to 31.3.51.....	713	3,866	4,579	81	30	111	794	3,896	4,690
1.4.51 to 31.3.52.....	609	3,909	4,518	20	14	34	629	3,923	4,552
1.4.52 to 31.3.53.....	690	4,615	5,305	44	10	54	734	4,625	5,359
1.4.53 to 31.3.54.....	532	3,508	4,040	40	3	43	572	3,511	4,083
1.4.54 to 31.3.55.....	490	3,383	3,873	79	18	97	569	3,401	3,970
WORLD WAR II INITIAL HEARING									
1.4.50 to 31.3.51.....	3,099	3,673	6,772	125	49	174	3,224	3,722	6,946
1.4.51 to 31.3.52.....	2,248	2,792	5,040	51	18	69	2,299	2,810	5,109
1.4.52 to 31.3.53.....	2,279	2,975	5,254	60	12	72	2,339	2,987	5,326
1.4.53 to 31.3.54.....	2,250	2,806	5,056	53	16	69	2,303	2,822	5,125
1.4.54 to 31.3.55.....	2,105	2,485	4,590	43	7	50	2,148	2,492	4,640
WORLD WAR I AND II INITIAL AND FIRST HEARING									
1.4.50 to 31.3.51.....	3,812	7,539	11,351	206	79	285	4,018	7,618	11,636
1.4.51 to 31.3.52.....	2,857	6,701	9,558	71	32	103	2,928	6,733	9,661
1.4.52 to 31.3.53.....	2,969	7,590	10,559	104	22	126	3,073	7,612	10,685
1.4.53 to 31.3.54.....	2,782	6,314	9,096	93	19	112	2,875	6,333	9,208
1.4.54 to 31.3.55.....	2,595	5,868	8,463	122	25	147	2,717	5,893	8,610

SECOND HEARINGS AND RENEWALS

	W.W. I second hearing			W.W. II renewals			World War I and II		
	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total
1.4.50 to 31.3.51.....	48	646	694	2,612	3,833	6,445	2,660	4,479	7,139
1.4.51 to 31.3.52.....	36	638	674	1,920	3,096	5,016	1,956	3,734	5,690
1.4.52 to 31.3.53.....	55	600	655	1,906	2,757	4,663	1,961	3,357	5,318
1.4.53 to 31.3.54.....	33	520	553	1,720	2,548	4,268	1,753	3,068	4,821
1.4.54 to 31.3.55.....	39	433	472	1,558	2,021	3,579	1,597	2,454	4,051

In establishing the number of veterans who are appealing Pension Commission decisions it is not particularly accurate to take the work of the Veterans' Bureau. They prepare initial and renewal hearings for W.W. 2 veterans, and first and second hearings for W.W. 1 veterans. The fact is that one W.W. 2 veteran may have an initial and several renewal hearings, so that it is felt that the statistics of the Appeal Board of the Canadian Pension Commission more accurately indicate the activity with regard to veterans who have been refused pension but who are pursuing the matter further.

	Total Number Received					Granted			
	Grand Total	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Special Force	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Special Force
1952-53									
To 31/3/53....	1,725	407	1,318	.....	.....	84	750		
	23,768	7,263	16,505	.....	.....	1,473	5,839		
*To 31/3/53.....	23,775	7,136	16,505	127	7	1,443	5,839	30	2
1953-54									
To 31/3/54....	1,761	366	1,302	83	10	85	622	14	3
	25,536	7,502	17,807	210	17	1,528	6,461	44	5
1954-55									
To 31/3/55....	1,718	323	1,236	136	23	96	638	19	16
	27,254	7,825	19,043	346	40	1,624	7,099	63	21
1955-56									
To 31/3/56....									
1956-57									
To 31/3/57....									
1957-58									
To 31/3/58....									

	Declined				Withdrawn				Pending			
	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Special Force	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Special Force	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Special Force
1952-53												
To 31/3/53....	346	783	.....	.....	7	41	.....	.....	−30	−256		
	5,398	8,613	.....	.....	79	813	.....	.....	313	1,240		
*To 31/3/53.....	5,322	8,613	76	1	76	813	3	1	295	1,240	18	3
1953-54												
To 31/3/54....	254	595	53	3	5	15	5	1	22	70	11	3
	5,576	9,208	129	4	81	828	8	2	317	1,310	29	6
1954-55												
To 31/3/55....	206	510	89	7	6	36	.....	.....	15	52	28	
	5,782	9,718	218	11	87	864	8	2	332	1,362	57	6
1955-56												
To 31/3/56....												
1956-57												
To 31/3/57....												
1957-58												
To 31/3/58....												

* Figures broken down to show W.W. 1 and Permanent Force separately; also 7 Special Force cases which were not included previously.

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO RENEW CLAIMS

—	Granted				Not Granted				Total
	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Spec. Force	W.W. 1	W.W. 2	Perm. Force	Spec. Force	
To 31/3/53.....	344	870	.....	.....	645	780	.....	.....	2,649
31/3/54.....	373	973	4	.....	681	883	3	.....	2,917
31/3/55.....	393	1,094	5	.....	722	995	5	.....	3,214
31/3/56.....									
31/3/57.....									
31/3/58.....									

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 27

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hugues Lapointe, Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director Mr. A. D. McCracken, Senior Administrative Officer, Mr. H. C. Griffith, Superintendent of Construction, and Mr. W. Strojich, Superintendent of Property, all of the Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; and Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director General, Veterans' Welfare Services. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

57610—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,
and Messrs.

Bennett (*Grey-North*)
Blair
Brooks
Bryce
Byrne
Cameron (*Naniamo*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Garland
Habel
Hanna
Hellyer
Lapointe
MacEachen
MacLean
Macnaughton
McLeod
Michener
Power (*St. John's West*)
Robichaud
Weselak
Yuill

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, April 29, 1955.

The Special Committee on Estimates begs leave to present the following as its

FOURTH REPORT

Your Committee has considered and approved items numbered 510 to 535 inclusive, 550 and 551 listed in the Main Estimates 1955-56 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, referred to it by the House on February 22, 1955.

A copy of the Proceedings of the Committee in respect thereof is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WALTER A. TUCKER,
Chairman

57610—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 27, 1955.
(34)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bennett, Blair, Brooks, Bryce, Cameron (*Nanaimo*), Churchill, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Habel, Hanna, Hellyer, Lapointe, MacLean, McLeod, Michener, Tucker, Weselak, and Yuill.

In attendance: From the Department of Veterans Affairs: Mr. F. T. Mace, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. F. Graves, Finance Division, Directorate of Finance and Stores; Mr. T. J. Rutherford, Director, Mr. A. D. McCracken, Senior Administrative Officer, Mr. H. C. Griffith, Superintendent of Construction, and Mr. W. Strojich, Superintendent of Property, all of the Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; and Mr. G. H. Parliament, Director General, Veterans' Welfare Services. And also Mr. J. L. Melville, Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission.

The Committee resumed consideration of the 1955-1956 Estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Minister and his officials supplying information thereon.

Items numbered 529 to 534, inclusive, 550 and 551, were adopted.

Agreed,—That the following tables be printed as Appendices to this day's Proceedings:

(1) Veterans' Land Act New Housing, showing number started, completed and under construction; and also the number and percentage of veterans acting as their own contractors. (*See Appendix "F"*)
(2) Summary of Settlement and Arrears, under Veterans' Land Act Administration. (*See Appendix "G"*).
(3) *Staff Summary—Veterans' Land Act.* (*See Appendix "H"*).

Mr. Rutherford and his officials were thanked and they retired.

Mr. Parliament explained the items relating to "Terminable Services".

Items numbered 435 and 510 were adopted.

Mr. Melville was recalled and he supplied additional information to the Committee.

Agreed: That further information, to be supplied by Mr. Melville, be printed as an appendix to this day's proceedings. (*See Appendix "I"*).

The Minister and his officials were thanked for their assistance to the Committee.

The Committee continued its sitting *in camera.*

The Chairman presented a draft "Report to the House", which was adopted, without amendment.

On motion of Mr. Yuill, seconded by Mr. Habel, the Chairman was ordered to present the said report to the House.

At 5.40 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

APRIL 27, 1955.
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we are still on item 529.

Mr. BRYCE: I wonder if it would be possible for the director to give me the following information? You have 115 soldier settlements on your books at the present time. Could you take five of these and tell me how much interest they have paid since 1919, not necessarily to the present date, but within a few months.

Mr. T. J. RUTHERFORD (*Director, Veterans' Land Act*): Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: Just take five. I will leave it to you to pick five that will be fair.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, we could get you that information very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on item 529?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if a word of explanation could be given us with regard to part 3 of the Act—additional loans for settlement as outlined on page 10 of the little book here. I was wondering if the conditions under which these loans are given are identical with, or close to, those applying to the loans obtainable under the original plan from the Farm Loans Board.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, Mr. MacLean, they are very much the same. We are very careful, though—and I think the Farm Loans Board are as well—to see that these loans are invested in such a way that they will add an equivalent value to the farm. It has often been said that one can spend $4,000 on a farm and only get $1,000 worth of value. I have asked our staff to assure that where money is borrowed under a Part III loan, it will add equivalent value should the property have to be sold, and that it will also be of sufficient productive benefit to enable the settler to repay the loan.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is the form in which the security is made?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is right.

Mr. BROOKS: I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, a question regarding payments. I understood yesterday that payments with regard to small holdings could be made by a series of 12 post-dated cheques.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is right. The number I gave yesterday was 12,000.

Mr. BROOKS: When these cheques fall due every month do you insist on payment of that cheque no matter what the circumstances may be as far as the veteran is concerned?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Once in a while a cheque comes back. However, the veteran generally arranges it.

Mr. BROOKS: Do you apply the same system under the Veterans' Land Act as you do under the farming operations?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Farmers pay annually. A very few of them pay monthly, but the great majority pay in November.

Mr. BROOKS: With regard to these small holdings—are these payments made mostly out of the product of the small holdings?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: A great many people raise enough on their small holdings to pay their instalments and their insurance. Some make a great deal more than this, but the majority pay out of their salaries.

Mr. BROOKS: I remember that some years ago there was some criticism, particularly in my province, that the men had to make their payments on certain dates whether the products of the farms were selling at a good price at that time or not. The products had to be sold in order to meet this obligation, which was not considered very good for the veterans. I was wondering if that situation had been relaxed and if they were now being given more time and told that they might wait until there was a better market for their product before meeting their payments?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The farm payments, to which your question would apply, are made in November and the farmers provide for that payment by putting money by from sales they may have made much earlier in the year. We have not experienced a great deal of trouble in collecting.

Mr. BROOKS: In New Brunswick, for example, farmers can get $8.00 a barrel for potatoes if they sell them at the present time, but if they had to sell them in November they would only get $1,00, or $1.25 for them. I was wondering whether the supervisors had these things in mind?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There is no doubt about that at all sir. It is being done. It is not being done generally, but in the case of New Brunswick potatoes, I am quite familiar with that situation and they are having some difficulty. They were fortunate that they had a heavy fall of snow and were unable to get their potatoes out. A good many veterans who are in arrears have potatoes left, and are now able to take advantage of the high price.

Mr. BROOKS: Do you have the same number of supervisors in western Canada in the grain growing areas as in the mixed farming areas in other provinces? If so, is there very much for these men to do during the winter months or after the grain grows in the spring?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We do not have quite as many there, but I would not say there was not as much to do since there are fewer small holdings in western Canada in relation to the farms. The numbers given to each supervisor in the east is greater than in the west due to the fact that there are more small holdings and small holdings are not so difficult to look after.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): What proportion of the veteran's livelihood is it anticipated he would get from a small holding?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We would like to think that he gets enough to pay his loan, his insurance and something else beside. Some are doing very well and are really full-time farmers. We are quite happy with the progress being made, particularly with regard to those on individual holdings.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I was wondering, since you have a different method of repayment for small holdings whether the idea had been that these holdings would merely provide a way in which veterans could have a place in which to live and that the payments which you get under the Veterans' Land Act are perhaps analogous to payments made under the N.H.A.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is quite right, sir. The actual money the majority use to pay comes out of salaries or wages.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): And it is anticipated that they will continue working?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Oh, yes. But some, as I say, have found that their small enterprise is developing into quite a large one.

Mr. BROOKS: How much money on an average do you collect in a year from the general operation of the Veterans' Land Act from the veterans?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Something in the neighbourhood of $18 million. I am not too sure. $18 million—that is interest and principal combined.

Mr. BROOKS: The interest would be about $5 million a year. The interest and administration—about $5 million a year to operate?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: About that. There are some items that come back to us. There are a few items that come under administration that return to the Receiver General.

Mr. BRYCE: How many supervisors are there in Manitoba?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Eleven work out of Winnipeg, seven out of Brandon, five out of Dauphin and two out of Port Arthur for the head of the lakes area.

Mr. BRYCE: Is a supervisor located in the inter-lake country?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, one.

Mr. BRYCE: Where is his headquarters?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I am not sure. I could tell you in a minute.

Mr. A. D. MCCRACKEN (*Senior Administrative Officer, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act*): At Arborg, when I last heard of him.

Mr. BRYCE: Do you not know where he is now?

Mr. MCCRACKEN: I am pretty certain he is still there.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I would like to come back to the question of the status of the small holders. In the case of men deriving their wages from outside occupations what action do you take—when such wages are the means of making the payments—if a man loses his job and is not in position to make his payment and is obliged to cancel payment on one of these post-dated cheques?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: He is just in arrears. We do not take any action. We want to encourage our settlers to give us post-dated cheques and it is no crime if they "bounce".

Mr. BENNETT: It has the same status as a promissory note?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): There is a certain amount of latitude given to a man in that position?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Definitely that is so. He is just in arrears.

Mr. MACLEAN: To get back to staff supervisors. I notice that the total given on page 628 shows an increase of 37 over last year and I notice that half of that number is made up of an increase in the number of settlement officers grade 2.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There has been no overall increase in the number of settlement officers. About 18 have been promoted from grade 1 to grade 2. They have put in the necessary time and have proved themselves to be eentirely satisfactory and we were able to promote them to grade 2. The overall number of settlement officers has, in fact, been slightly reduced. As I mentioned yesterday we have 257 fields and we have 253 settlement officers operating in these fields at the present time. Some are carrying two fields at the moment. Some small adjustments in the fields may reduce the number slightly, but not very much.

Mr. MACLEAN: And what is the position with regard to constructors?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We are asking for 31 additional construction supervisors but as I said yesterday we are not appointing any more until we see how the work is building up. We do not want to take people on temporarily and then have to lay them off. For the time being we are trying to get along with those we have.

Mr. MACLEAN: That brings us to this plan of veterans constructing their own homes. I take it that is the way these supervisors are employed?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes. Of course, they supervise regular contractors too but we have a very small proportion of these.

Mr. MacLEAN: Now I would like to have a statement as to how this scheme is progressing and whether a large number of veterans are still expected to take advantage of this scheme and in what centres they are allowed to have this little course in home construction?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We try to arrange a course wherever there are five or more veterans who wish to attend. The other question which you asked was how this is progressing.

Mr. MacLEAN: Yes. Is it anticipated that a large group will still come forward to take advantage of this scheme in the near future, or at any rate in the course of the next year or two?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We were rather late getting started this year and as I mentioned yesterday, we have had in round numbers 119 schools during the past eight months with an attendance of 3,385. Since the inception of the "Build Your Own" plan we have conducted about 450 schools. The percentage of attendance was large—over 80 per cent of those enrolled attended each lecture. The lectures numbered 20 in all and they cover quite a wide range, including administration, the selection of the property, the siting of the house, the proper buying of supplies in order that material is on hand only when it is required, and many other things which contractors should know aside altogether from the technical work of building houses. There are some items we do not teach since we do not consider the veteran should touch them unless he is an export in that particular trade.

Mr. BROOKS: Do they pay their own expenses for transportation?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is right.

Mr. BROOKS: And generally are these night courses spread over a period of time, or do you have fulltime courses in some instances?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They are generally spead over a number of weeks, and are held one night a week for a period of two hours. Sometimes when there is a rush or when we have to move a supervisor temporarily to a school the course would be run as many nights per week as possible, but generally they are held one night a week, and in the winter.

Mr. MacLEAN: What is done in cases where the veterans live in more remote places where it would not be possible for them to go the nearest school?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We make special arrangements for them. Sometimes they get along very well and often build better houses than chaps who live in towns.

Mr. BROOKS: Do you have to pay for the instruction of these classes?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Our own supervisors do a large part of it, Colonel Brooks. The majority are held in technical schools; they put on the course, and use our syllabus. They might have some civilians on the course as well as veterans. There is a very nominal fee charged which is refunded in the case of a veteran who takes a contract to build under Part II. It is a very nominal initial fee.

Mr. BROOKS: On page 628 of the estimates, I notice an item which reads: "Consulting engineers, surveyors, etcetera, $22,000; and repairs to property $1,500" under the heading of "Upkeep of property, Veterans' Land Act."

The CHAIRMAN: That is item 530, Mr. Brooks; it is the next item.

Mr. BROOKS: I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on item 529?

Mr. MacLEAN: I have just one question. If I remember correctly, in various areas you have a sort of competition between veterans who are settling on small holdings in relation to the appearance of the property and so forth?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, we ran a competition for three years. We have not done this in recent years, but it is often done locally. There are a lot of local competitions put on by the field supervisors. These are arranged without consulting head office.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN:

530. To provide for the 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, $65,500.

Details on page 628. This is the item you were asking about, Mr. Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS: Yes. There is probably a good explanation for this. I notice that consulting engineers and surveyors are paid $22,000 and there is an item for repairs to property of $1,500. There are taxes of $21,000 which of course would not come in although the maintenance of public utilities, an item of $12,000, might. On the face of it, it would appear that it is costing as much for consulting engineers and surveyors as it is for repairs to the property?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There are very few property repairs for which we are responsible. These are on the properties that we are holding and there is very little on that account. The consulting engineers and surveyors are engaged to lay out subdivisions on property that we have bought and are subdividing into small holdings. Quite often too we have to get someone to make a special survey for the purpose of giving title. We have many properties and sometimes there is a dispute concerning title. We have to guarantee the settler a good title and sometimes it is necessary to have a survey made. There are a number of items of that kind.

Mr. BROOKS: It is listed here as upkeep of property and nothing is said about surveying. This appears at the bottom of page 628.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Consulting engineers, surveyors, maintenance of public utilities and so forth. We operate several utilities which we have not been able to transfer to the municipalities. When these subdivisions were originally laid out in 1945, it was necessary for the director at the time to arrange for the installation of utilities. We have a few left. Two are here in Ottawa, one at Carleton Heights and the McKellar property on Carling avenue. There is one at Deschenes, one at Bowness near Calgary, one at New Brunswick, and one at Stratford, Ontario.

Mr. BROOKS: Are the consulting engineers doing that work; that is what I want to find out? Are the men who are mentioned here who are paid $22,000 doing the work you mentioned, or are they simply looking after the upkeep of property?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, they lay out and plan subdivisions.

Mr. MACLEAN: Strictly speaking then, Mr. Chairman, it would seem more appropriate for the $22,000 item which relates to these four surveyors to appear under the heading of administration?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They are not our people; that "4" does not refer to the number of surveyors.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am sorry.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We have a certain amount of this work distributed all over Canada in various districts wherever we are opening up subdivisions or have to verify boundaries of property in order to give good and sufficient title.

Mr. MACLEAN: But what I am getting at is that it appears here under the heading of "Upkeep of property" and strictly speaking it should actually be under "Administration" should it not?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is the way it has always been, if that is a good excuse for this item being there—I do not know. They are not our regular employees at all.

Mr. BROOKS: All you do is pay them?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, and direct them as to what we wish to have done.

Mr. BROOKS: As long as they are earning their money that is all we care about.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be difficult to put this item under administration, because it includes taxes, for instance, and therefore could not be put under administration.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was only referring to the consulting engineers and surveyors. As it appears here, you have in this total item, upkeep of property, Veterans' Land Act, and you get the impression that $22,000 is spent in pay to engineers as compared to an expenditure of $1,500 for repairs to property.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There is no relationship, sir; none at all.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what I mean; it is misleading.

Mr. WESELAK: Would maintenance of public utilities refer to local sewage facilities?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, it is our costs on the various projects I mentioned such as the one at Carleton Heights, Deschenes, McKellar, one near Moncton, New Brunswick, and one at Stratford, Ontario. There is a sewage disposal in Stratford for a few houses which we look after. We have been able to get the municipalities to take over the others. We are continually endeavouring to get the municipalities to take over these utilities.

Mr. BROOKS: Where is the one in New Brunswick?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: At Harrisville in New Brunswick.

Mr. MICHENER: My question might relate to the item we have already passed, but I want to inquire about the use of the Central Mortgage Corporation inspectors for the work of inspection of construction being done under the Veterans' Land Act. I would like to know if any use was made of the other department inspectors.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Not under the Veterans' Land Act work proper, sir, but C.M.H.C. makes the final inspection on houses that are being built under Part II of the Act, because they take over the mortgage. They are responsible for the final inspection although they might ask us to do it, but I think in practice they will make it.

Mr. MICHENER: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation make the final inspection?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, on houses being built for them under Part II of the Veterans' Land Act.

Mr. MICHENER: Are these all handled through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, just the ones having to do with Part II of the Act where we build on a small lot, and where we assist the veteran to the extent of giving him technical advice and legal help and where we advance the money required during the period of construction.

Mr. MICHENER: What proportion of the starts would be in that category?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: This year we have only 30 to date. We have 101 being processed at the moment, and we expect 825 this year.

Mr. HELLYER: How long does it take for Central Mortgage and Housing to process the applications?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They do very well. As I said yesterday, this is being done at the local level, and we are receiving wonderful cooperation throughout the country from them. Like ourselves, they try to do as much of the work at the local level as possible.

Mr. MACLEAN: Do I understand that the early inspections are made by your own departmental inspectors and the final inspection, in cases where the loan is a Central Mortgage and Housing loan, are made by Central Mortgage and Housing?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: So there are two sets of inspectors working on the same property?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We do the supervising of the work, and they come to see that it is all right, or else they take our word for it.

Mr. MACLEAN: But only in cases where they have loaned money?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: But are the others cases where your department has advanced the money?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, where veteran contractors sign an agreement to purchase which becomes effective when they move in.

Mr. MICHENER: Would you elaborate on the question of your inspectors making inspections for other departments of goverment?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: During the last fiscal year and the one previous, we did something like 1,200 appraisals for the Department of Finance in connection with properties that are being rented to civil servants throughout the country; lighthouse keepers, bridge keepers, the R.C.M.P., some on experimental farms and what have you.

Mr. MICHENER: That is the extent of it, is it?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We are also doing appraisals for the Departments of National Defence and Public Works. In fact, a few years ago, we were asked to appraise Stanley Park.

Mr. MICHENER: Did you say Chorley Park?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, Stanley Park.

Mr. MICHENER: As a result of your answer, I think my next question should be directed to the minister. What I am interested in is whether or not there is any economy to be effected both for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and for this department in using one set of inspectors to handle both types of loans. Has any consideration been given to that? I ask the question because it appears that there are a certain number of joint inspections made by the two departments?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as C.M.H.C. is concerned, my understanding is that they are encountering difficulties in finding sufficient inspection staff for their own work. They may call on us because in a particular locality we may happen to have the facilities and their own staff is pretty limited. The director can correct me if I am wrong, but as far as inspection work done for other departments, for instance the R.C.M.P., is concerned this will arise in cases where the government will purchase a house as a home for an R.C.M.P. officer in charge of a detachment in some remote locality where we happen to have inspectors who are familiar with real estate in that area and we can provide the service. It would undoubtedly be more costly, to my mind, for these various departments who have not got a continuous flow of that type of work to have their own services.

Mr. MICHENER: Yes, I see that there is an economy in having your inspectors supervise construction in an isolated locality for another department. My point is—could that economy be carried forward to the point of having

one set of inspectors to handle all construction by all government departments, and I raise the question because I would think that most of these veteran house constructions on the small holdings would be in areas where Central Mortgage and Housing inspectors are now located under the new Act and who would inspect loaning?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: My understanding of it is that at the present time there is not a duplication but rather that we might be called upon to supplement or complement their inspection services.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is not so much a question of inspection as of supervision of contracts.

Mr. MICHENER: By your department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We guide the veteran. He is a "green" contractor who has only had a short course. We call around about once a week to ensure that he is doing the work properly, and if not, we have him take it down and change it. We ensure that he builds according to sound standards. It is a very intimate type of supervision.

Mr. MICHENER: It is a sort of tutelage?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, we give our staff special training in supervision. Colonel Griffiths believes that our function can be best achieved if we have a staff of well trained construction supervisors.

Mr. MICHENER: In that sense, they are instructors and are different from Central Mortgage and Housing inspectors?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, quite, and their locale is different. We do more work out in the country and in smaller places than they do.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Perhaps you could satisfy my curiosity. Why did you appraise Stanley Park? Do you know why it was appraised?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I could not tell you.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I wondered if they were going to sell it?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I do not know. It took one man a month to do the job and they seemed fully satisfied with the appraisal.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): I simply asked because it is such an odd thing to do.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Good appraisers are very scarce. We are presently busy training our field staff across Canada in order to increase their efficiency in this work, and we are hoping that within two years they will all have the degree of A.R.A., accredited rural appraiser.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have one question based on a paragraph in the annual report which relates in part to this item, and I am simply asking the question for information.

The CHAIRMAN: What page?

Mr. CHURCHILL: It appears on page 50 of the annual report. It is just a question of information because having served for two years under the command of Brigadier Rutherford in the war days, it is with some difficulty that I present questions to him.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You can get back at him now!

Mr. CHURCHILL: The third paragraph on page 50 reads:

> Mineral rights are included in the title to many properties held by the director and, during the year, 115 petroleum and natural gas leases were approved, bringing the total since inception to 2,869. The proceeds of these leases, which may be redisbursed for acquiring additional land, effecting permanent improvements to the properties, or applied to the individual veterans' accounts, amounted to approximately $739,900. In addition, 12 sales of oil royalties involving $41,000 were approved, with the proceeds being applied to the veterans' accounts.

Are the proceeds of these mineral rights available to the individual veteran, or are they pooled, or what?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They belong to the veteran, and we give him the option of applying them; he can buy additional property or improve his property. He has to add to the security and as long as he does that it is all right. It is mostly rentals; they are not much—maybe enough to pay his taxes. We insist on his spending it on the property, and if there is something beyond that he repays his debt, but the money belongs to the individual. If the director buys the mineral rights he transfers them to the settler.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The proceeds are not disposed of by the veteran without direction from the department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: The mineral rights do not necessarily go with the title to the land?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: In just a few cases. If we get the mineral rights, we pass them on, but there are not many properties, in western Canada particularly, that carry mineral rights. They have been reserved in the past.

Mr. MACLEAN: Now to refer to a different subject. Under this item, Mr. Chairman, on page 20 of this little booklet entitled "The Veterans' Land Act" there is a paragraph which reads as follows: "Only under certain conditions will veterans who previously received assistance under Part I be qualified for home construction assistance under Part II." I would like a word of explanation concerning that paragraph. Does that mean under certain circumstances a veteran cannot benefit under both parts of the Act?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, if he has not moved from the locality and has received one assistance, he cannot receive another assistance, but if he has moved to another locality for some reason we will permit assistance under Part II.

Mr. MACLEAN: In other words, he cannot receive assistance under both parts at the same time?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, unless he sells out and moves. If he wants to change to Part II in the new location we will let him do so, but not in the same town.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yesterday you mentioned cases where veterans might be established on a farm on which there was not a home, and you mentioned that this occurred on occasions on the prairies. It would not be possible for a veteran in a situation of that sort who wanted to have a home on his farm to receive any additional benefits under this section if he wanted to dispose of his present home which was not located close by?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No, not under Part II, because that is a Central Mortgage and Housing arrangement for small lots, but he could use the money he would get under a Part III loan. We are not encouraging this because we believe that in most cases if we are going to spend something like $7,000 or $8,000 to build a home, while there are farms which can be bought with good homes on them, the $8,000 could be used to much better advantage in this way. The veteran could probably get as good a home as he could build together with a farm for $8,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was thinking of a veteran who was established and for some reason or other—let us suppose that he has been burnt out—he wants to build a new home. Does he qualify for assistance in constructing his own home? I do not mean financial assistance necessarily.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: A farmer veteran?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: He can take one of our courses.

Mr. MACLEAN: And his construction job would be supervised and he would be assisted?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, and we might give him a Part III loan to use along with the insurance.

Mr. MACLEAN: But he would also receive supervision?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, Colonel Griffith gives service to farmer veterans who are making additions to their homes.

Mr. BROOKS: I intended to ask a question under item 529 concerning the British farm settlers.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There are quite a number of them. I do not have the figures before me. At the present time we treat them as civilian purchasers. There are 261 strictly British families at the present time, but we have other properties that were British family properties which have now been sold to other people. We do not keep them separate any longer because it is not necessary. We treat them all as civilian purchasers.

Mr. BROOKS: How much is still owing?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: $202,957.76 including the current year's instalment but the amount in arrears, as of December 31 was $16,434.

Mr. BROOKS: It is practically paid up?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes. That which concerns British family settlers. There were quite a number who abandoned their farms.

Mr. BROOKS: Did that occur in any one province or all across Canada?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: In New Brunswick and out west.

Mr. BROOKS: How many years ago? 1930—a long time ago?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, it was in the late twenties and early thirties; I am not just sure. We treat them strictly as civilian purchasers now. Some of them have done very well.

Mr. BROOKS: How many of them are dead?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 531.

> To provide for the payment of grants to veterans settled on Provincial Lands in accordance with agreements with Provincial Governments under Section 38 of the Veterans' Land Act and payment of 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, $300,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: In what provinces have you veterans settled under this arrangement?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: In all provinces except P.E.I. and Nova Scotia.

Mr. BROOKS: How are they making out?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Some of them are making out very well. Generally speaking, however, they have not been as successful as those who have settled on established farms.

Mr. BROOKS: They were pioneering?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: They went in and built their own homes?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, and some of them did very well.

Mr. BROOKS: Are they making their payments regularly?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There is no payment to us; they pay to the provinces. We have separate agreements with each province, and they vary a great deal. I visited quite a number of these settlers last year in the northern part of the prairies and British Columbia. They are right on the frontier and they are doing fairly well.

Mr. MICHENER: How are these grants distinguished from other purchases?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is a grant of $2,320 which is made available to a veteran who has settled on provincial land for the purchase of livestock, clearing, breaking and making permanent improvements to his property. It is secured by the land for 10 years. If a veteran leaves within the ten-year period and takes anything away, we have security in the land.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this land that is being homesteaded?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is practically homesteading. It is not done on quite the same terms as the old homestead plan, but it is being granted. Some land was turned over to the director and we are selling it to veterans. This applies in parts of British Columbia and Alberta.

Mr. MICHENER: These grants are not entirely related to purchases of land, but are related to purchases of equipment and improvements to the land?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER: And do they include the actual purchases of land?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No sir.

Mr. MICHENER: There is no price paid for land in this case, I suppose?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They pay the province for it. We have various agreements with the provinces. I could go over them all, but they are quite lengthy and rather involved. The agreements with each province are different.

Mr. MICHENER: In this case, I suppose the payment for the land itself is a minor part of the settlement cost?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The consideration in most cases is good husbandry, clearing and breaking—

Mr. MICHENER: Performance?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, and performance very much like the homesteaders but there is rent charged in some cases; however, it is very fair.

Mr. MICHENER: In any cases where there is a conflict between the interests of your department and of the Crown in the right of the province, which would still own the land until certain conditions could be verified?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It depends on the particular relationship. We are secured.

Mr. MICHENER: It is not complicated by inter-provicial departments?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No. I had a letter this morning from Manitoba where they had a bad time with floods in the Birch river settlement, and the cooperation received from the province was wonderful.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was wondering if there is noticeable difference in the ability to pay their commitments of the veterans who settled immediately after the war and those who settled later on, five years after the war, when the cost of machinery and stock had risen a great deal. What I mean is that the fellow who got in early right after the war got far greater value for his money in the way of machinery and stock. For instance, he could purchase with $1,200 a two plow tractor after the war and that would only make a down payment by 1951 or 1952. The early settlers appear to be at a financial advantage over the later ones.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Surprisingly enough, the evidence is somewhat the other way. I have the figures as to those who left their farms and almost invariably they are the earlier settlers who settled on cheaper properties running from

$3,000 to $4,000. These were the settlements on which we took losses. There was a great rush of settlement in the early days. Some obtained very good properties very cheaply. Mr. Murchison bought a great deal of land which was made available to veterans at a very good price. However, some of the veterans looked for land themselves and since our supervisors were not as experienced at that time, the veterans who were insistent were permitted to buy property which we would not allow them to purchase today. Our people have now had more experience and can appraise land much better. However, some of those early settlers have done very well indeed.

Mr. MACLEAN: I will put my question in the opposite way. Is it generally found that settlers who settled say after 1950 had sufficient capital to carry on properly under the high prices existing at that time?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They only had enough capital to start with, but having once got their feet under the table they are going ahead. Very few of them, unless they had funds of their own, were able to get what you might call an economic unit, but they are fast developing these. Part III is going to be their salvation. That is really why our minister tried to have it put on the statute books—to help lift these farm settlers over ths hurdle. The extra loan is coming at a better time than if they had got it previously.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 532: "To provide for the payments of grants to Indian veterans settled on Indian Reserve Lands under Section 39 of the Veterans' Land Act"—$125,000.

Mr. BRYCE: Can you tell us what they are for? I did not ask you anything about the Indians because I suppose if we want to know anything about them we should ask the Minister responsible for Indian Affairs.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is used in very much the same way as the provincial land grant, for the erection of buildings and permanent improvement to the property on Indian reserves where a veteran may get an occupation ticket to land.

Mr. MICHENER: Who is in charge of the administration of this grant?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Indian Affairs and we provide the funds on requisition.

Mr. MICHENER: This money is paid over to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and administered by that department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: They do get the benefit of the supervisors and skilled administrators you have in your department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: If they ask us, but the Indian agent looks after them.

Mr. BRYCE: Is there good cooperation between you?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: I have Indian reserves in my constituency. Can you tell me if there are many settlers on the reserves in the Lake country?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I do not have the figures.

Mr. BRYCE: Maybe you could get them for me?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, or the Indian Affairs Branch could get the figures faster. There are 78 in Manitoba altogether.

Mr. MICHENER: Have any Indians settled outside the reserves under the V.L.A.?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, but not under this provision. This provision is for reserves only.

Mr. WESELAK: Has this settlement with the Indians been successful?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: As far as we know.

Mr. BRYCE: An Indian outside the reserve is covered—

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The same as a white man.

Mr. MICHENER: The department exercises a discretion as to anything being paid?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Indian Affairs do.

Mr. MICHENER: Would it not be more appropriate if it were in the Indian Affairs branch? It seems to me if this department does not say how much money should be paid out then it should be in the other department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We have to guarantee the settler's status as a veteran.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that the only function your department has?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is our only responsibility under the Act.

Mr. MICHENER: To see whether the Indian is a veteran or not?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. CHURCHILL: On the balance sheet in the annual report at page 52 you have under the heading "Non-repayable grants not yet earned, Indian veterans —section 39 V.L.A.—the sum of almost $3 million. What is that?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is where the Indian veteran on the reserve has been settled for less than ten years and has not earned his grant. When he earns his grant then the book is balanced.

Mr. MACE: If you look at page 53 of the annual report which shows the liability section of the report it sets up the same item as a liability.

Mr. CHURCHILL: What is the significance of that item? I did not quite understand your explanation, Brigadier Rutherford. What happens? What is this money for?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It is for the purchase of stock and equipment, but mostly for permanent improvements to the property, such as the building of a house or a barn. Most of it goes into houses on reserves.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It has not yet been utilized?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, but not earned by the Indian as yet because he has not been settled for 10 years.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It will be earned at the conclusion of the 10 years?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. MICHENER: It is an accumulation of votes like this one over the past years?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: Do you collect the payment from the Indian or is it done by the Indian Affairs Department?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Only whatever they collect in the way of taxes on the reserve. It is a grant just the same as the provincial land grant.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 533.

To provide for the reduction of indebtedness to the Director of Soldier Settlement of a settler in respect of a property in his possession, the title of which is held by the Director, or such Soldier Settler Loans which are administered by the Indian Affairs Branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, by an amount which will reduce his

indebtedness to an amount in keeping with the productive capacity of the property or his ability to repay his indebtedness under regulations approved by the Governor in Council, $15,000.

Mr. BRYCE: Sometimes I am critical, but I want to congratulate the department on the reduction of the indebtedness of the soldier settlers. I just wish that it had been more and that it had been earlier. But it is good and I hope you will be able to do more.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 534.

To authorize and provide, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, for necessary remedial work on properties constructed under individual firm price contracts and sold under the Veterans' Land Act 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, $5,000.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Could we have an explanation of that?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There are a few hidden defects which are turning up in the houses built in 1945-46 under the firm price contracts at that time, which we had no way of finding out about until now. It could be a case of the wrong kind of sheeting put on the house and certain rotting developing. Sometimes we find insulation piled in the corner of the attic, also defective septic tanks. It is things of that kind for which we need a small amount. For instance, in case we have to dig up a septic tank to see what the trouble is.

The CHAIRMAN: I see there was nothing spent on it last year at all.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No sir.

Mr. BRYCE: They fixed them good the year before.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): Does that imply that the contractor did not comply with the specifications?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: It could or we find that neither the veteran nor the contractor could be held responsible. Very often we cannot find these contractors now; they are not in business. We may believe that the veteran is entitled to have the repairs made.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 550.

To provide for protection of security—Soldier Settlement, and refunds of surplus to veterans, $12,000.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I might say that we have about $10,000 roughly which we have collected as surpluses on the sale of soldiers settlement property. We advertise this amount practically every year in the "Legionary" and in other ways. There is also about $13,000 more that is still on a bookkeeping basis and may be available later as refunds to settlers.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Carried.

Item 551.

To provide for purchase of land and permanent improvements; cost of permanent improvements to be effected; removal of encumbrances; stock and equipment; and for protection of security under the Veterans' Land Act, $22,636,500.

Mr. BROOKS: What is the explanation of that item?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is the item on which we operate, Colonel Brooks.

The CHAIRMAN: This is the other side of your question. You asked what they collected in spending $5 million and this is what they put out in getting more land and making more settlements.

Mr. BROOKS: It is about $4 million short of what is was last year.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Last year we were anticipating the legislation and the legislation had the reverse effect. People waited. They were expecting it and put off being settled. Most of them were too late for last year and that was why last year we did not come up to our estimate. We have been running very close to the estimate for the last few years.

Mr. BROOKS: Most of the purchasing has been done as far as farmers settling is concerned?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We do not buy backlog farm properties any more. We buy them as we need them. We have quite a number of veterans still awaiting establishment who are qualified. In 1953 there were 999 qualifications issued to farmers; and 1,148 in 1954. To small holders there were 6,027 issued in 1953 and 5,949 in 1954.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would like just a word of information on the position of the veterans who owned farms and were farming before they went in the service and after they got out of the service. Do they benefit to the same extent providing their property comes up to the required standard?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Under section 15 of the Act we can give them a 3½ per cent mortgage.

Mr. MACLEAN: The benefits they receive are just about the same as if they were established?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No. But they can keep their reestablishment credit and get a mortgage loan at 3½ per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN: They do not get any grant for stock and machinery; they do not qualify for that?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They have title to their land already.

Mr. MICHENER: Looking at these two items of capital grants which I suppose are the funds from which lands are purchased and buildings built—the working capital—the anticipated reduction is about $3,800,000 which is about 15 per cent of the money voted last year. It is a substantial reduction in the amount of money going to be spent. One might have expected a corresponding reduction in administration costs if there is to be that much reduction in work done which is the same as money spent. I would like to ask for the explanation of there being no reduction in the administration costs which I take it are represented by item 529. There you have $5 million in round figures and instead of a reduction there is an increase of $91,000 as against a decrease of 15 per cent of the money that will be used. When will the saving begin in administrative costs?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Our work is cumulative and we have more accounts all the time to service and collect. It is the work of keeping our settlers in a position where they can not only pay their debt but where they will succeed and become successfully established. That is one reason. The other reason is that the work is cumulative. The more accounts we have, the more there are to look after. There is another thing and I do not know whether I should say it, but we expect we will need a supplementary if things keep moving the way they are now.

Mr. MICHENER: A supplementary of working capital?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: A supplementary in this vote. Yes, working capital.

Mr. MICHENER: I take it that the work is really increasing for the Veterans land department.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The only reason we have been able to cut staff is—

Mr. MICHENER: And it has been increasing up to this point and until that diminishes your administrative costs will not come down.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: They are not likely to. The only way we can reduce it is by increased experience.

Mr. MICHENER: When do you think you will reach the peak of expenditure in this veterans' land branch?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We have passed the peak which was back in 1946.

Mr. MICHENER: I am referring to administrative costs.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I would say the costs of administration depend on the cost of different items such as car expenses and salaries. If these costs remain as they are, administration costs should never be any more than they are now. There is also the question whether we will need those additional 31 construction supervisors. This depends on how much work we have under part II which is just nicely getting started now.

Mr. MICHENER: Well, I would think that looking ahead 5 or 10 years you could see the completion of your construction program and the repayment of your accounts and I am asking you whether you can forecast at all the cost of administrative expenditure—will it continue to go downhill, and where does it diminish entirely?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: To do that one has to go back to the history of soldier settlement. The situation which gives rise to increased administrative expenditure is the one which arises when you have people failing and getting into trouble, and that is the time when you need a lot more help. If we had a lot of failures among our settlers and they were not getting on as well as they are, we would not now be able to manage with the staff we have.

Mr. MICHENER: Your experience *is* very good now—your payments are good and you have, I think, 60,000 accounts on your books, roughly?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is right.

Mr. MICHENER: Now, if your present experience continues, in the course of ten years these accounts will be all paid off?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Pretty well all of the early ones would be paid off, but of course we are still settling people today.

Mr. MICHENER: The only reason the department would continue beyond that time would be because there was another war, or a new reason for expenditure like the vote we are just now making. I would think that in the ordinary course of events you could foresee a diminishing expenditure both of capital and on administration from some point in the near future until it faded out almost entirely. I am asking you when that point of decline would begin in your estimation?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That is a difficult question to answer. I wish I knew the answer to it. I think we are going to settle about 30,000 more people. That is a guess, but I have looked into this very carefully and I think expenditure will go down over the next ten years. However, something tells me that this will be a very gradual process. What part II of the Act is going to bring forth, I do not know. The new loans to farmers under part III constitute very much the same work as the purchase of new farms. We do a complete appraisal of the farm concerned to see what its potential is, and we work out a plan with the farmer; we want to know how he is going to spend the money which he proposes to borrow and to ensure that he is going to spend it to advantage to himself and to our security.

Mr. MICHENER: You feel then there are a lot of veterans qualified to come under this Act who have not yet made any application?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: 18,900 have qualified and are standing by. New ones are coming on at the rate I have already mentioned, about 6,000 a year.

Mr. MICHENER: Your guess is that there might be 30,000 more veterans who would take advantage of the Act?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Outside of part II altogether.

Mr. MICHENER: It looks as if there will not be an early termination of your activities.

Mr. MACLEAN: When a farmer is settled his commitments last for 25 years, so that in the normal course of events one would expect that the accounts of second World War veterans would begin to be closed about 1970.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: There will be quite a few closed by then.

Mr. MACLEAN: They would then rapidly become closed?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I think I mentioned yesterday that there are over 4,000 veterans who have repaid us entirely. We have already 98 who have earned their conditional grants. They are not off our books but they have gone past the ten year period.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You mean 9,800?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Only 98 veterans who have earned their conditional grants.

Mr. MICHENER: There is one more question of fact about which I should like to ask. May I have the expenditure for the last fiscal year as at present ascertained?

Mr. MCCRACKEN: You mean on administration, Mr. Michener?

Mr. MICHENER: 529 to 534—this year.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: $4,775,985.

Mr. MICHENER: That is actually for the fiscal year ending in 1955.

Mr. MCCRACKEN: That is for administration, sir.

Mr. MICHENER: You are asking this year for $4,998,000. You are asking for $220,000 over the actual expenditure for last year. Does that seem to be necessary?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We have provided in that for 31 additional construction supervisors who have not been taken on yet. We may not have to take them on. We do our best to keep expenditures down and naturally we do not want to take on anyone whose services we shall not need for a definite period.

Mr. HELLYER: Are these construction supervisors presently being trained?

Mr. H. C. GRIFFITH (*Superintendent, Construction Division*): No. They have not been engaged. We have got to go out and get them in the field.

Mr. BROOKS: How often do these people make an inspection?

Mr. GRIFFITH: Inspections average between about 15 per contract up to perhaps 100 in some cases where we have veterans who are poor as contractors —veterans who are not of the better type and who need a lot more supervision.

Mr. BROOKS: But a supervisor can inspect half a dozen contracts a day, can he not?

Mr. GRIFFITH: He might. He might only be able to do two or three a day. It would depend on the distance which he has to cover and the problems he has on his hands. He might have to frame a veterans' roof for him or do something like that which would take him the best part of a day. On the other hand if problems like this did not arise and if he were working in a concentrated area he might cover ten or fifteen visits in one day.

Mr. BROOKS: Would he consider it necessary to make more than one visit a week to an individual contractor?

Mr. GRIFFITH: In some cases he might have to make two or three. For instance, if a veteran was pouring concrete he might have to go back to see if the veteran was preparing the proper type of concrete, or mixing the correct aggregate, or whether he had the right crew.

Mr. BROOKS: He would hardly be overworked if two or three more were added to each supervisor?

Mr. GRIFFITH: No. But as I say the number of their visits varies from between two or three to perhaps ten or fifteen in a day.

Mr. BROOKS: Do the seasons make any difference—whether it is winter or summer?

Mr. GRIFFITH: As a matter of fact they are very busy in the summer, and extremely busy in the spring and fall, because the veterans are starting construction in the spring and anxious to "close in" in the fall to avoid damage from frost.

Mr. BROOKS: It is not likely that you will need 31 extra.

Mr. GRIFFITH: It depends on what arises from part II. As we stand at the present time we should be able to get by with our present staff.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been thinking, gentlemen, that the table filed by Brigadier Rutherford—the one on page 13 which indicates the new housing, showing the numbers started, completed and under construction, and the number and percentage of veterans acting as their own contractors—would be of general interest. I think that many colleagues who are not on this committee might be very interested in these figures. To me they indicate that the Veterans' Land Act administration is doing a very splendid job in assisting veterans to build their own homes, and would the committee agree with me that it would be a good thing to put that table into our records as an appendix to our report? There will be many people looking at the reports of our proceedings in addition to our parliamentary members who may be interested in it, too. What does the committee think about that suggestion? Is it agreed that it should be included?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: There is just one point for the record. There is a reference to PI voucher. Would you explain that Mr. Rutherford?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That stands for permanent improvement voucher—generally used in farm construction. We buy the building material for the farmer by a permanent improvement voucher and he does the work.

The CHAIRMAN: Then it is agreed that this will be printed as an appendix to our proceedings—the schedule on page 13. (*See Appendix "F"*). Then there is table B—recapitulation of farms and fishing accounts showing the number of part-time farmers as of April, 1955, the number who are in arrears and the number of new farm settlements; the number still qualified but not settled on full time farms, accounts fully prepaid, and the same information with regard to small holding accounts.

I think that was is set out under those headings would give a very informative picture to anyone who is not a member of our committee and I think it would also make our records more helpful if it were printed as a further appendix to our proceedings. Is that agreed? (*See Appendix "G"*).

Agreed.

Mr. WESELAK: What is the total amount owed by those in arrears, including the $200 and anything less?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We only have the December figure, which, of course, is very much higher than now because the farm accounts are payable in November. This figure should be cut more than a third, probably to a half by now. The answer as of December 31, is farms $1,300,945, and small holdings $85,000.

Mr. WESELAK: In this table—"fully qualified"—what does "purging" mean?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: We had a lot of qualified veterans who had not been settled and we knew that a great many of them had made other arrangements. We purged the list thoroughly by writing a letter to each individual.

Mr. BROOKS: You told me a while ago that collections amounted to about $16,000,000 a year.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: That must be last year's figure. In 1953 it was $18,000,000.

Mr. MCCRACKEN: The previous year's revenue was around $18,000,000—principal, interest and everything else.

Mr. BROOKS: For last year, then, $1,900,000 is still due?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: $1,385,945 was due at the end of December immediately after all the farm accounts became due. We have cut that figure way down in the meantime. As at March 31st last it was $734,000.

Mr. BROOKS: That is considered good? It is about the average?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes, but this year we have a lot more arrears in the west. The number of accounts which are $200 and more in arrears is in western Canada higher than last year.

Mr. BROOKS: Why do you set the figure at $200? Is there any particular reason?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: No. We just take those over $200. They are the only ones we worry about.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another table which we as an estimates committee would I think be justified in having on our record, and that is a record of the staff employed by this branch of the department, I find it very interesting, and I am sure that others would. That is on page 27. As I understand it the record shows that the total staff—head office, district office and regional field—was 1,714. It goes down to 1,360 in 1950 and 1,082 in 1955. That is broken down into head office staff, district office staff, and regional field staff and is divided between administration officers, clerical officers and construction officers, and supervisors and field supervisors. It seems to me that that would be a very valuable table to have on our records.

Mr. MICHENER: By contrast it is quite interesting compared with the rise in number in other departments.

Mr. BROOKS: Yes, but it is quite understandable. This department has settled over 60,000 men on farms. They have had to advise the farmers, to supervise the buying of the equipment and so on, and most of this work had to be done in 1946 and 1947. It does not surprise me that the staff has diminished.

The CHAIRMAN: What I had in mind was that we as a committee are interested in going into the question of to what extent it is true, as it is sometimes thought, that when people are no longer needed, as Colonel Brooks said, they are kept on in the employ of the government anyway. These figures are very interesting as showing what you might expect did happen when this department which had a great deal of work to do and the work tapered off. you find here that the number of employees tapered off too, and I think that we as a committee are interested in seeing that this did happen and I think our colleagues would be interested, too. Is it agreed that this should be printed as an appendix? (*See Appendix "H"*)

Agreed.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: The peak was reached previous to 1947. It was in 1946, and it was 1,860.

The CHAIRMAN: The peak was 1,860?

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Yes. In April, 1946.

Mr. MICHENER: I find it difficult to understand why those figures are going down when the Brigadier has told us that he does not feel he has reached the peak of expenditure and administration. Perhaps in the early years of work more staff were required on construction work, but now more collection supervision is necessary, I took Brigadier Rutherford's answer to mean that this is a long lived operation which has not reached its maximum number of veterans by any means yet and which may go on still for a great many years. However, it is interesting to see how a department is able to reduce its staff.

The CHAIRMAN: Is item 551 carried?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be only fair to say that I think the committee does appreciate very much the very fine presentation which Mr. Rutherford and his officials have made to us.

Mr. MICHENER: Is that the end of Veterans' Affairs?

The CHAIRMAN: No. We are coming to item 535:

> Rehabilitation benefits, including the training of certain pensioners under regulations approved by the Governor in Council, $2,199,000.

Mr. MICHENER: Can we hear something about that? Where is the vocational training being carried on? In what provinces and centres?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: In most of the provinces and in all the universities of Canada. Some students are still in the United States and in the United Kingdom. There are only 8 in the United Kingdom at the present time.

Mr. DUPUIS: Except in the province of Quebec.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Some C.B.T. schools have been closed but the Ryerson institute in Toronto has quite a number at the present time.

Mr. MICHENER: What veterans are receiving this instruction?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Some pensioners, Korean veterans and World War II veterans who have been in hospital. But the same vote carries the children of the war dead who are in the universities.

Mr. MICHENER: Have you used all the vote last year? I notice this is less than half of last year's?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: $199,000, roughly.

Mr. BROOK: Of course, with the Korean war over you do not anticipate so many applying?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: No, sir. That is why we reduced the sum.

Mr. MACLEAN: A year ago there were 493 undergraduate students of World War II still continuing university training. I would think that by this time that number would drop off very rapidly?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: It will drop off from now, but there are many of these people engaged in postgraduate courses.

Mr. MACLEAN: But these 493 are undergraduates.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Some of the Korean veterans would be in that.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am referring just to veterans of World War II.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Yes, that number will drop off very rapidly from now on.

Mr. DUPUIS: Where is the estimate with regard to vocational training?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That comes under the Department of Labour. It is a different scheme altogether.

Mr. PARLIAMENT: In answer to Mr. MacLean's question may I say that 100 veterans of the Korean war and 143 veterans of the second war are undergoing vocational training, 342 are in training as undergraduates at the universities and 53 are taking part in postgraduate instruction, for the period 1954-55.

Mr. MACLEAN: These are veterans who delayed taking university training, are they not? Or are they veterans who were hospitalized or something?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Generally speaking, they were hospitalized veterans and pensioners who were not ready to start their training despite the fact that they were out of hospital, and some delay occurred.

Mr. DUPUIS: Is there any age limit for veterans taking advantage of this vocational training plan?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: There is no age limit, but it must be commenced within 12 months of discharge unless the veteran is a pensioner.

Mr. MACLEAN: And what about university training?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: It must be commenced 15 months after discharge.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: —unless he can show why it was impossible for him to commence it at that time. It might have been because of personal, family, or financial circumstances or illness.

Mr. HELLYER: I wonder if the minister thinks there are unemployed veterans today who could benefit by further educational and technical training if that restriction and time limit were removed?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think we have ever considered that problem, nor am I sure that it has ever been put to us. I am informed that recently there was an increase in vocational training for pensioners for whom the time limit does not apply.

Mr. HELLYER: Does the department receive inquiries from veterans who are not aware of their entitlement to see whether or not they do qualify for vocational training?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Parliament informs me that we receive very few here. Most of these inquiries are handled on the district level, and his office would not have that information.

Mr. MICHENER: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we have readily available the price of university training payments for the last fiscal year; that is, by universities.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No I do not think we have that information by universities.

Mr. MICHENER: Is it broken down by provinces? How is it made out? How much was spent last year on university training altogether?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: That we can tell you.

Mr. MACE: These figures are not quit complete sir, because we have not yet received the end of the year figures. With your permission I will give these in round figures roughly, will that be all right?

Mr. MICHENER: Yes.

Mr. MACE: Allowances, $254,000; tuition and other fees, $8,000; allowances to children of the war dead, $59,000; tuition fees for children of the war dead, $76,000, making an approximate total of $480,000.

Mr. MICHENER: That is up to the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. MACE: It is really only 11 months, sir, because the last accounting period is still to come.

Mr. BROOKS: What percentage of children of the war dead would you say are taking university training or would you have records showing that?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I could not answer that question, Colonel Brooks, but since its inception 498 applications for training have been approved and there are 365 people in training at the present time.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): When you say "in training" what does it mean?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Attending university or taking a course that requires pre-matriculation.

Mr. BROOKS: Would nursing schools also be included in that?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Yes, a high percentage of the girls are in nursing.

Mr. MACLEAN: Has there been a rapid increase in that number with regard to World War II in recent years? I would imagine that a lot of these students would be just reaching university age?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, we will reach the peak in about eight to ten years, because most of these children are still of high school age or of prep school age even.

Mr. BROOKS: Could you give us information regarding loans made to the universities for veteran students?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Since the student veteran loans were authorized on October 1, 1946, a total of 1,959 loans have been made for an aggregate of $502,320.15 as of December 31, 1954. Outstanding loans—and many of these were not due—totalled $216,826.60. This is 43·16 per cent of the total loans made and includes loans made but repayment not yet due. During the current year, 1954, repayments totalled $46,681.97.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo*): These would be loans to veterans who had not sufficient credits to continue university training?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: No, they were in receipt of allowances and met with some need which the allowance did not cover. They took a loan out and it is not due until the first of the month following graduation.

Mr. MACLEAN: Could we have a word of explanation about the item concerning unemployment insurance contributions?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: I will ask Mr. Mace to give you an explanation. Those were contributions for members serving in the forces.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You will recall that after the world war veterans being discharged and unemployed were paid out of work allowances. Under the Veterans Pension Act we changed that and made it possible for these people to draw unemployment insurance rather than the department pay out of work allowances, and then there are contributions paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and Mr. Mace might explain the mechanism.

Mr. MACE: The mechanism is handled this way. If a veteran is registered with the U.I.C. and has not received credit on his unemployment insurance card for his war service then they refer the matter to our department. Our department certifies to his war service, through the war service records division, and then we get authority from the chief treasury officer to pay the U.I.C. a certain amount of money which is quite a considerable amount.

Mr. MACLEAN: In reality it is a retroactive contribution for unemployment insurance for the time the veteran was in the service.

Mr. MACE: That is so.

Mr. MACLEAN: When does it become available?

Mr. MACE: On discharge now, sir. There is a regular arrangement and procedure that when he is discharged the man is referred to us right away. It is set up immediately. His credit is set up immediately on discharge.

Mr. MACLEAN: This is a very big sum of money. It would pay a lot of unemployment insurance. Surely there are not that many veterans being discharged today in the current year?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Members of the regular forces; at the cessation of the Korean hostilities there were many men who were, for instance, in the army with a term of engagement in the regular forces for three years if they did not re-enlist and quite a proportion of them did not.

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the maximum payable under the Act?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: 96 cents.

Mr. MACE: We pay both the veterans' and employers' contribution.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much is that maximum?

Mr. MACE: 96 cents.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is $50 a man.

Mr. MACE: Possibly you might be interested, sir, in the monthly figures of ex-members of the regular force for which we paid U.I.C. contribution from April 1954 until September. In April there were 786 and we paid $86,800. In May there were 344 and we paid $38,500. In June there were 2,796 and we paid $273,800. In July there were 1,092 and we paid $103,300. In August, there were 1,211 and we paid $118,900. In September there were 1,474 and we paid $139,500.

Mr. BROOKS: These men come back and do they get employment immediately alloted to them or do they draw unemployment insurance?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think we have the answer to that.

Mr. BROOKS: I thought perhaps you might know offhand what proportion.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: We might get that from the U.I.C.

Mr. BROOKS: A good many come back to jobs they left which were guaranteed to them when they enlisted and I wondered how many came back to their jobs?

Mr. PARLIAMENT: If the man was in insurable employment while away we had an obligation to build up his unemployment insurance account to protect him even though he does go back to the job and becomes subsequently unemployed.

Mr. MICHENER: It is about a two years payment you are making for each man on the average and that would mean about 13,000 men you anticipate being discharged and paid up this year.

Mr. MACE: Our actual estimate is actually 1100 and an average payment of $100.

Mr. MICHENER: Is this a routine matter for every man that is discharged.

Mr. MACE: It is now.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It is now. It will stop being so after the 1st of July of this year if this Veterans Benefits Act amendment which will come before the committee tomorrow is passed by the House.

Mr. MICHENER: Will there be anything take its place?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MICHENER: It just disappears from the expenditures entirely.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: From D.V.A. at any rate.

Mr. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman, am I right in assuming that the unemployed veterans will not be able to collect this unemployment insurance unless U.I.C. are unable to place him in a job. He has to go to the Unemployment Insurance Commission I assume and be informed that there is no employment for him before he applies?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: He has to register with the U.I.C. office. He meets the same statutory provisions as any civilian.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what I assumed. If a veteran of World War II, shall we say, has gone back to his job immediately after he got out of the service and has been employed ever since up until now and now becomes unemployed, does the department have to make a contribution on behalf of him?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: He is just an ordinary civilian and he has made his contribution and so has his employer. This was revised to replace this benefit, which was known as out of work allowance which followed discharge from World War II, because it was found through experience that the administration of this out of work allowance had to be done in such close liaison with the U.I.C. office that it was just as well, and as a matter of fact was more efficient and more economicial to qualify the man for his unemployment insurance by paying his contribution and the employer's contribution, so that his time in the services would not debar him from the benefits which would have accrued to him had he not served.

Mr. MACLEAN: A short time for the Korean war and some time now—it would be very small anyway.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: At the present time it covers the regular forces and that is why this amendment is being brought into the Veterans' Benefit Act, simply because we feel that many of the members of the regular forces are not veterans within the meaning we have of that expression—they have not served in a theatre of operations.

Mr. MACLEAN: No. Or special force men to be discharged on July 1.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: They are all discharged, or they have transferred into the regular forces and have signed a regular engagement.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what I mean. I would think that this commitment should belong to the Department of National Defence rather than to that of Veterans Affairs.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Please don't ask me to commit myself. This has been a bone of contention for some time as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried, gentlemen?

Carried.

That brings us back to the main item—item 510:

"Departmental Administration—$2,230,141." Is that carried?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, I asked at least three questions yesterday when we were dealing with the Canadian Pension Commission and the answers have not been brought before the committee. What happens?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry, I do not quite follow you. I missed the question.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I said that yesterday I asked at least three questions to which I did not get answers. There may have been more. When will these answers be produced, and will they become part of the minutes of our proceedings? For example, I was asking about the number of world war veterans placed on pension, the total number of awards made up to the present date and the total number of refusals; I also wanted to know the estimated number of World War I veterans still living who have not made applications for pension at any time. That was one question. The second question referred to the disability awards for 1954-55. The figure was given to us, but I wanted it broken down according to the degree of disability. The third question which I asked was in respect to the total number of applicants for pension from the

services in peacetime showing total awards and total refusals in connection with section 13, subsection 2. As I say there may have been other questions which were not answered, but those are the ones which I can recall at the moment.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Ah, here is Brigadier Melville.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Churchill has mentioned some questions he asked yesterday and you Mr. Melville have arrived in the nick of time to save the situation.

Mr. J. L. MELVILLE (*Canadian Pension Commission*): In response to Mr. Churchill's inquiry and the question by Colonel Brooks yesterday, I would like to table two statements giving the totals regarding decisions rendered by the commission respecting service in peacetime.

Mr. MELVILLE: Table A shows the number of decisions rendered by the commission up to and including the 31st day of March, 1947 which was the end of World War II, for the purposes of the Pension Act. Also the total as at the 31st of March, 1955. This table contains the percentages requested by Colonel Brooks.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that Table A be inserted in our proceedings?

Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

TABLE A

REGULAR FORCES

DECISIONS RENDERED ON ENTITLEMENT FOR INJURY OR DISEASE AND DEATH

Total
As at 31.3.47

	Granted		*Not Granted*		
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*Total*
First Hearing	443	12·05	3,234	87·95	3,677
Second Hearing ..	24	6·40	351	93·60	375
Appeal Board	35	26·92	95	73·08	130

88·14% of total claims were rejected

Pensions in force

	As at 31.3.47	
	No.	*Ann. Liab.*
Disability	118	$ 44,659
Dependent	22	$ 16,760
Total	140	$ 61,419

Total
As at 31.3.55

	Granted		*Not Granted*		
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*Total*
First Hearing	824	11·77	6,174	88·23	6,998
Second Hearing ..	53	6·73	734	93·27	787
Appeal Board	63	22·42	218	77·58	281

88·35% of total claims were rejected

	As at 28.2.55	
Pensions in force	*No.*	*Ann. Liab.*
Disability	490	$ 243,713
Dependent	284	$ 440,999
Total	774	$ 684,712

Mr. MELVILLE: Table B gives details of peace-time decisions rendered by the commission in each of the past five years up to and including the 31st of March, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that this table be included in our proceedings?

Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

TABLE B

DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE CANADIAN PENSION COMMISSION ON EX-MEMBERS OF THE REGULAR FORCES

Period	First hearings			Second hearings			Appeal board			Total		
	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total	Granted	Not granted	Total
Year—												
1.4.50 to 31.3.51	42	318	360	4	53	57	5	15	20	51	386	431
1.4.51 to 31.3.52	59	479	538	—	67	67	7	18	25	66	564	630
1.4.52 to 31.3.53	116	837	953	8	105	113	7	34	41	133	976	1,109
1.4.53 to 31.3.54	169	1,494	1,663	5	168	173	12	53	65	186	1,715	1,901
1.4.54 to 31.3.55	276	2,189	2,465	18	290	308	19	89	108	313	2,568	2,881

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Melville, do you have a copy for Mr. Churchill in order that he may see if the three questions he asked have been fully answered?

Mr. MELVILLE: Yes, I have an extra copy of Table A, and I believe Mr. Mace has an extra copy of Table B.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Churchill can examine the tables now.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, I asked for a breakdown of the disability awards for 1954-55 according to the degree of disability. I also asked a longer question concerning World War I veterans who had been placed on the pension roll from 1918 up to the present time. I was interested in knowing the total number of awards granted in the intervening years, the total number of refusals, and the estimated number of World War I veterans who are still living but who have not made application to the Pension Commission at any time. From the figures available to me, and they are by no means complete, I estimate that about 200,000 veterans at some time or other have been either placed on the pension roll or have made application and were refused. The information was supplied to me by the Department of Veterans Affairs which seems to me to be a very efficient division of the department. I do not know the number of veterans who have died in the interval or the number that are still living and are not on the pension list, but I think such an estimate could be made by the division.

Mr. MELVILLE: I would be very glad indeed, Mr. Chairman, to receive a copy of the proceedings of this committee in order to take note of Colonel Churchill's questions and answer them. However, with regard to the last question, I do not see how we can possibly estimate as to the number of W.W. I survivors today. It is all in the realm of speculation and I fail to see what would be accomplished. Also, there are thousands who have never at any time applied for pension.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You may not be able to answer the last part of the question, but I think you could answer the earlier part. I can make the speculations after I receive an answer to my first questions which are questions of fact. The number placed on the pension rolls from the beginning—the grand total—and the number of awards made in the intervening years; that is a question of fact which is not complete in the documents, that is all. The number of refusals was another question. In the report for 1950, the number of refusals was shown from 1918 to that date, but I do not have the figures and they are not shown in the other reports covering the period from 1951 to 1954. That is all I am asking for. If I have that information, I will speculate with regard to the survivors.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as the survivors are concerned, I think that can can establish the number of World War II veterans through the 1951 census. However, I do not know whether or not we can establish the number as of this date. Similarly, we know the number that were pensioned and you can obtain that information, but I do not think we have figures for any period beyond 1951.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would be satisfied with information taken from the last census. Actually, the report indicates the pensioners who died during the year and it also says that about 3,000 veterans of the first world war were reported as dead during the course of the year; but how they get those figures, I do not know. Actually, in the record here the number of pensioners who have died during the year is indicated. The record also shows that about 3,000 veterans of the First World War have been reported as dead in the course of the year. How do they get those figures? I don't know.

Mr. HELLYER: Mr. Chairman I am sure it would be agreeable to my friend Mr. Churchill if the answers to the questions which he has asked were obtained and put in as an appendix to our proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that be satisfactory, Mr. Churchill?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes. There may be other questions, but we have not got the record in front of us.

The CHAIRMAN: I was just going to put this proposition—that these questions be answered and made an appendix to the proceedings, in which event we could report the department to the House. Alternatively we could meet again; I imagine that one meeting would enable us to deal with these questions, receive the answers and consider any further questions which might arise out of them. We might meet at 3.30 p.m. on Friday if the committee should wish to do so.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would not have any questions arising out of those answers.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if you were to see Brigadier Melville and make sure that he has got the questions you want answered, and make sure that he has answered them fully it could be agreed that the answers he makes should be made part of the proceedings of our meeting, and if that is acceptable to you we could consider a final report on the record of this department. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall not be able to make this report until I am able to include this appendix, so I will hold it until I get the appendix which we have agreed should be made part of the proceedings today. But subject to that, the report which I shall make will be as follows—but perhaps a word should be said in appreciation of our genial minister and of all his officials who have appeared before us in regard to their evidence and their appearance before us.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think the minister should express appreciation to us because he has not had to answer many questions.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I have many reasons to express my appreciation to members of the committee but I did not quite get the one you mentioned.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I said you did not have to answer many questions.

Mr. MICHENER: I think we all ought to express our appreciation to the officials of the department, particularly, for explaining their work to us so clearly. It has been of great interest and help.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear hear.

Mr. CHURCHILL: May I make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, which you might be able to consider. To assist people who have to examine the book of estimates and the details of services it would be very helpful if the number of the vote were to be printed in brackets after the title of the vote which occurs in the details of services. If members of the committee will look on page 630 I can make this clear. "Rehabilitation Benefits" it says "including the training of certain pensioners" if in brackets after that occurred the words "vote number 535" it would be very clear to members considering it. And then the words "service gratuities." Underneath that would be in brackets the letter "s" indicating "statutory." That would help us in searching through the book of estimates; could you give consideration to that?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Estimates are drawn up by the Department of Finance and the treasury but I will be very glad to bring this to their attention.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is a very good suggestion myself.

We will now continue in camera.

Committee continued in camera.

APPENDIX "F"

V.L.A. NEW HOUSING SHOWING NUMBER STARTED, COMPLETED AND UNDER CONSTRUCTION ALSO NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF VETERANS ACTING AS THEIR OWN CONTRACTORS

FROM INCEPTION TO DECEMBER 31, 1954

—	Started		Completed	
	Total started	Veteran contractor	Total completed	Veteran contractor
Project Houses, 1945–46	2,673	—	2,673	—
By Contract	14,313	9,616	12,575	8,034
By P.I. Voucher	2,866	2,866	2,552	2,552
Total	19,852	12,482	17,800	10,586

BREAKDOWN FOR YEARS 50/51/52/53 AND 54

Breakdown covering past five years	Started			Completed			Under Construction		
	Total started	Veteran contractor	% Veteran contractor	Total completed	Veteran contractor	% Veteran contractor	Total under con.	Veteran contractor	% Veteran contractor
			%			%			%
For year 1950—By Contract	1,931	1,484	77	1,669	1,057	63	2,402	1,925	80
By P.I. Voucher	796	796	100	871	871	100	434	434	100
Total	2,727	2,280	83½	2,540	1,928	76	2,836	2,359	83
For year 1951—By Contract	1,433	1,183	82½	1,789	1,335	74½	2,046	1,773	86½
By P.I. Voucher	326	326	100	359	359	100	401	401	100
Total	1,759	1,509	86	2,148	1,694	79	2,447	2,174	88½
For year 1952—By Contract	1,209	992	82	1,523	1,235	81	1,732	1,530	88
By P.I. Voucher	92	92	100	121	121	100	372	372	100
Total	1,301	1,084	83	1,644	1,356	82½	2,104	1,902	90
For year 1953—By Contract	1,759	1,477	84	1,464	1,223	83½	2,027	1,784	88
By P.I. Voucher	79	79	100	147	147	100	304	304	100
Total	1,838	1,556	84½	1,611	1,370	85	2,331	2,088	89½
For year 1954—By Contract	1,365	1,186	87	1,654	1,388	84	1,738	1,582	91
By P.I. Voucher	104	104	100	94	94	100	314	314	100
Total	1,469	1,290	88	1,748	1,482	85	2,052	1,896	92

APPENDIX "G"

Veterans' Land Act Administration

SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT AND ARREARS

RECAPITULATION

FARM AND FISHING ACCOUNTS

Paying Annually

Number of Full Time Farmers and Commercial Fishermen as of April 1955	29,121
Number of Farmers and Commercial Fishermen $200 and over in Arrears April 1955	811
Number of New Farm Settlements past 12 months	979
Number Fully Qualified but not Settled—List purged January 1954	3,282
Full Time Farms accounts fully Prepaid	2,031

SMALL HOLDING ACCOUNTS

Paying Monthly

Number of Small Holders as of April 1955	30,519
Number of Small Holders $100 or over in Arrears April 1955	42
Number of New Small Holding Settlements past 12 months	2,720
Number Fully Qualified but not Settled—List purged January 1954	15,794
Small Holding Accounts fully Prepaid	522

APPENDIX "H"

STAFF SUMMARY—VETERANS' LAND ACT

Classification	Dominion summary			Head office staff			District office staff			Regional and field		
	1947	1950	1955	1947	1950	1955	1947	1950	1955	1947	1950	1955
Senior administrative	94	95	82	9	9	6	44	49	42	41	37	34
Junior administrative	71	74	62	6	10	9	22	26	22	43	38	31
Senior clerical	207	159	131	25	33	30	97	69	62	85	57	39
Junior clerical	331	212	134	77	52	25	134	87	64	120	73	45
Stenos and typists	498	338	250	62	40	27	217	152	119	219	146	104
Senior construction	31	37	32	3	4	5	19	17	14	9	16	13
Construction supervisors	106	85	88	—	—	—	25	6	7	81	79	81
Junior construction staff	59	61	49	1	5	3	44	30	23	14	26	23
Field supervisors	307	299	254	—	—	—	9	3	1	298	296	253
Totals	1,704	1,360	1,082	183	153	105	611	439	354	910	768	623

APPENDIX "I"

Information supplied by the Chairman, Canadian Pension Commission, as requested by Mr. Churchill.

OTTAWA, 4, Ontario,
April 28, 1955.

Walter T. Tucker, Esq., Q.C., M.P.,
Chairman, Special Committee on the Estimates,
House of Commons,
OTTAWA, 4, Ontario.

Estimates—Canadian Pension Commission.

The following information is furnished in response to questions asked by M. Gordon M. Churchill, M.P., when the Estimates of the Commission were under consideration by the Committee yesterday:

Statistics covering major activities in disability pensions for World War I, commencing Fiscal Year 1922-23, will be found on page 103 of the Annual Report of the Department of Veterans for the year ending March 31, 1950.

The corresponding figures for the next four years up to March 31, 1954, follows:

WORLD WAR I

MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN DISABILITY PENSIONS

Fiscal year ending	Awards		Reinstatements		Discontinuations		No. of refusals	No. of beneficiaries	Supplementary pensions
	No.	Annual liability	No.	Annual liability	No.	Annual liability			
		$		$		$			
31.3.51.....	394	203,869	196	79,279	2,044	1,142,374	1,458	127,777	405
31.3.52.....	318	154,453	140	67,613	2,030	1,188,491	1,526	124,601	411
31.3.53.....	276	85,459	131	31,117	2,517	1,776,679	1,845	118,280	434
31.3.54.....	210	63,295	124	29,219	2,338	1,651,427	957	112,599	456

Statistics for year ending March 31, 1955, are nearly complete and will be published in the Annual Report for the Fiscal Year just ended.

A breakdown was asked of the disability awards for 1954-55 according to the degree of disability. Details of the actual awards are contained in the following table:

NUMBER OF AWARDS BY PERCENTAGE OF DISABILITY

PERIOD 1.4.54 TO 31.3.55.

Class	Percentage	World War I	World War II	Total
1	98 to 100	8	102	110
2	93 to 97	—	—	—
3	88 to 92	—	4	4
4	83 to 87	—	—	—
5	78 to 82	3	8	11
6	73 to 77	—	5	5
7	68 to 72	1	4	5
8	63 to 67	—	4	4
9	58 to 62	4	15	19
10	53 to 57	—	2	2
11	48 to 52	5	42	47
12	43 to 47	1	1	2
13	38 to 42	5	44	49
14	33 to 37	2	9	11
15	28 to 32	12	46	58
16	23 to 27	4	51	55
17	18 to 22	16	229	245
18	13 to 17	16	141	157
19	8 to 12	68	714	782
20	5 to 7	70	838	908
TOTAL		215	2,259	2,474

The question was asked as to whether information was available regarding the number of World War I veterans who have died in the interval since discharge, or the number that are still living and are not on the pension list.

Based on the 1951 census and the Canada Life Tables issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, it is estimated that 301,889 World War I veterans still survive.

A question was asked regarding the number of World War I veterans who had died during the year.

Appendix "A", Table 1, of the Annual Report of the Department contains a summary of pension activities and shows:

Disability pensions, World War I, discontinued during the year on account of death 2,326

For the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1955, the number of such deaths was 2,195

It must be noted that these are deaths of disability pensioners and, therefore, a matter of record with the Commission.

No information is available regarding the actual number of World War I veterans who died during the year under review—records are available for pensioners only.

I trust this disposes of all the questions which were asked.

J. L. Melville,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.

PROCEEDINGS

No. 28

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Hon. Walter E. Harris, Minister of Finance; Mr. K. W. Taylor, Deputy Minister; Mr. J. J. Deutsch, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. B. G. McIntyre, Comptroller of Treasury; Mr. G. E. Lowe, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955

57691—1

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chairman: W. A. TUCKER, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Argue
Bennett (*Grey North*)
Cannon
Churchill
Deschatelets
Dupuis
Enfield
Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*)
Habel
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hellyer
Lusby
Macdonnell (*Greenwood*)
Macnaughton
McWilliam
Michener
Monteith
Nesbitt
Pommer
Power (*St. John's West*)
Regier
Thatcher
Yuill

E. W. Innes
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

MONDAY, July 4, 1955.

ORDERED,

That items numbered 112 to 127 inclusive; and item 539, in the Main Estimates 1955-56; and items 653 to 656 inclusive, and items 789 and 795 in the Supplementary Estimates, 1955-56, relating to the Department of Finance, be withdrawn from the Committee of Supply and referred to the said Committee, saving always the powers of the Committee of Supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

TUESDAY, July 5, 1955.

ORDERED,

That the name of Mr. Harris be substituted for that of Mr. Lapointe; and

That the name of Mr. Thatcher be substituted for that of Mr. Byrne; and

That the name of Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt) be substituted for that of Mr. Garland; and

That the name of Mr. McWilliam be substituted for that of Mr. Robichaud; and

That the name of Mr. Pommer be substituted for that of Mr. Weselak; and

That the name of Mr. Macdonnell be substituted for that of Mr. Blair; and

That the name of Mr. Monteith be substituted for that of Mr. MacLean; and

That the name of Mr. Nesbitt be substituted for that of Mr. Brooks; and

That the name of Mr. Argue be substituted for that of Mr. Cameron (*Nanaimo*); and

That the name of Mr. Regier be substituted for that of Mr. Bryce; and

That the name of Mr. Hahn be substituted for that of Mr. McLeod; and

That the name of Mr. Lusby be substituted for that of Mr. MacEachen on the said Committee.

Attest.

Leon J. Raymond,
Clerk of the House.

57691—1½

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY, July 6, 1955.

The Special Committee on Estimates begs leave to present the following as its

FIFTH REPORT

Your Committee has considered and approved items numbered 112 to 127, inclusive; and item 539, in the Main Estimates 1955-56; and items 653 to 656 inclusive, and item 789 in the Supplementary Estimates, 1955-56, relating to the Department of Finance, referred to it by the House on July 4, 1955.

Your Committee has also considered and approved item 795 in the Further Supplementary Estimates 1955-56 relating to the Department of Fisheries.

A copy of the Proceedings of the Committee in respect thereof is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WALTER A. TUCKER,

Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, July 5, 1955.
(35)

The Special Committee on Estimates met at 11.15 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Argue, Cannon, Churchill, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Enfield, Habel, Hahn, Hanna, Harris, Hellyer, Lusby, Macdonnell (*Greenwood*), Macnaughton, McWilliam, Monteith, Nesbitt, Pommer, Power (*St. John's West*), Regier, Thatcher, Tucker.

In attendance: From the Department of Finance: Mr. K. W. Taylor, Deputy Minister; Mr. J. J. Deutsch, Assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. B. G. McIntyre, Comptroller of Treasury; Mr. G. E. Lowe, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister.

The Committee proceeded to the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Finance.

Item 112—Departmental Administration was called.

A general discussion of the operations of the department followed, Mr. Harris supplying information thereon.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

(36)

The Committee resumed at 3.00 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Walter A. Tucker, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Argue, Cannon, Deschatelets, Dupuis, Enfield, Habel, Hahn, Harris, Hellyer, Lusby, Macdonnell (*Greenwood*), Macnaughton, McWilliam, Monteith, Nesbitt, Pommer, Power (*St. John's West*), Regier, Thatcher, Tucker.

In attendance: Same as at the morning sitting.

The Committee continued the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Finance for the year 1955-56.

Item numbered 112 was further considered and allowed to stand.

Items numbered 113 to 127 inclusive, and 539 in the Main Estimates were considered and adopted.

Agreed,—That a list of the Universities receiving grants under item numbered 126 be printed in the record. (*See Appendix "J" to this day's proceedings.*)

Items numbered 653 to 656 inclusive and item numbered 789 in the Supplementary Estimates were considered and adopted.

Item numbered 795 in the Further Supplementary Estimates was adopted.

The Committee reverted to item numbered 112—*Departmental Administration.* It was further considered and adopted.

The Chairman read a draft "Report to the House". The report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Hellyer, seconded by Mr. Hahn, the Chairman was ordered to present the said report to the House.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. Innes,
Clerk of the Committee.

PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, July 5, 1955
11:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. We have before us the estimates of the Department of Finance referred to us by the House. The first item is 112 under "General Administration", page 20 of the estimates.

112. Departmental Administration (including the former Administration of Employees' Instalment Purchase Plan and Employees' Group Insurance Plans), $1,965,633.

The Minister of Finance is here with his officials and perhaps we might have a word from him as to those who accompany him, and some indication of what order he would like the estimates to be considered in.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, we are in the hands of the committee. We could take the estimates in the order in which they appear in the book. We might as well go through them in that order. The officials are here with respect to the Treasury Board, Taxation, and all the other matters in the blue book, so I think I shall follow the practice of my predecessor who apparently never made any opening remarks on the subject of his estimates, and leave it to the members of the committee to ask questions.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Mr. Chairman, this is a very formidable array that we are facing. Perhaps it would be just as well for the Minister of Finance to describe these officials in detail so that we might be warned.

There is one general item to which I would like to refer. I assume that the greatest of the tasks of the Treasury Board and the Department of Finance is to regulate, as far as they can, the expenditures of the other departments. There are a great many things in the actual figures which are hard to debate because they are statutory; but that does not mean that we cannot talk about them. Even though they are pretty well fixed.

Mr. REGIER: Mr. Chairman, I take it that we shall be here only until 1:00 o'clock. Therefore, may we have the fan turned off?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that is a good idea. I doubt if it is doing much good anyway in weather like this.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): My point is this: would the minister, or whoever he may designate, describe to us in some detail, the way the estimates are made up, and the way in which the Department of Finance deals with the other departments? We might, if we could, have a general statement, and this would facilitate the asking of more detailed questions.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is a very simple process. The minister writes to his colleagues in the cabinet sometime in early October a formal letter requesting that the estimates of their departments be forwarded within a certain date. When they have been received, the opposite numbers, if I may put it that way, in the Treasury Branch deal with the estimates of the departments with which they are supposed to be concerned.

There are many conversations back and forth between the officials of the department and the officials of the Treasury Board with the result that if there are expenditures which can be postponed or dealt with in another manner, they are eliminated from the estimates which will ultimately be presented to the Treasury Board.

The Treasury Board, as you know, consists of a committee of the cabinet which varies in attendance from four to seven or eight, depending on the circumstances.

The Treasury Board sits three times a week throughout the whole of November, December, and sometimes January, interviewing the officials and the ministers of all the departments in sequence, and discussing the estimates which have been submitted in a preliminary form at that time. There are further representations, and in most cases some items are eliminated. And then upon conclusion of that, printing begins, and you end up with the blue book which you have here.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): The minister has used two phrases concerning which I would like to have further explanation. He speaks about the Treasury Board interviewing officers of the various departments. Before that, what he called the opposite numbers had conferred with each other. I take it that would be by way of preparatory work for the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I am assuming that it is extremely difficult for the Treasury Board to go into very much detail in the case of each department. Therefore, I would ask the minister to indicate to us in some detail the nature of that preparatory work conducted with what he called the opposite numbers. I want to point up my question. What I am seeking to get is how far into detail the Treasury Board does go, either directly or through its opposite numbers.

I want to read a statement which, as a matter of fact, I used in the House last January. It is from the Winnipeg Free Press, and I read it because it seems to me to point up the question how far the Treasury Board does in fact go in assuming responsibility, and how far it leaves it to the departments. The extract is this—it comes from the Winnipeg Free Press, around the end of the year, I think January 30th or 31st:

> Careful study of the federal civil service indicated that the cause of the hitherto uncontrollable growth was simple. Whenever there was a need for expansion, the departments expanded. They did not search within themselves for surplus personnel and meet the need for expansion by making better use of their existing staff. They invariably added to it.

Let me interject to say that whenever I have been speaking about this I have always pointed out that this seems not only unfair to the taxpayers but to the exising civil service as well, because it means that instead of promoting those already in the service it would only mean adding new personnel.

> To illustrate; if a bridge is built across the St. Lawrence, there would have to be a customs house at the Canadian end of it staffed by customs and immigration officers. The opening of the bridge would greatly reduce the number of people entering the country by ferries. But instead of transferring men from the ferry ports to the bridge, the tendency would be to add to the payroll by appointing additional staff at the bridge.

I would not read this if it did not come from a responsible source, but it does lead to a question having to do with this very case.

Let us take the case of the Ivy Lea bridge. My question is how far does the Treasury Board, through its machinery, assume responsibility, how far does it inquire into the operation of the other departments, and how far does it leave it to the other departments to assure the Treasury Board that they have done the best they can?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: To use your example: an examination of whether or not additional staff would be needed upon the opening of an additional bridge would be done originally in the departments of Customs and Immigration; and then those departments would be faced with an explanation as to whether there would be other facilities which would be eliminated because of this additional port of entry.

As a matter of fact, you made a good point, because to build a bridge does not as a rule eliminate a ferry. People want the service they already have, and they want additional service. There are very few additional things you can add which substitute one service for another. Consequently you would not be able to reduce the number of persons on the ferry service unless the number of turn-arounds was cut down.

That would be examined by the deputy minister of both departments and if they could save one or two men because of the transfer of personnel to the bridge, they would do it, and transfer them to the port at the bridge. If, however, that has not been done, the Treasury Board itself would pass on the request for additional personnel; it would ask for an explanation as to whether or not additional personnel have to come by recruitment or whether they can be found within the department in some other manner; and until they are satisfied that they are required there will not be a recommendation that additional personnel be obtained by the department.

Mr. MCWILLIAM: Would the Civil Service Commission have to pass on it?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, the Civil Service Commission and the departments particularly concerned.

Mr. MONTEITH: The minister sends a letter to his colleagues asking for their estimates, and at that time he instructs his own officials to prepare their estimates too. I wondered just how his own department went about it. I assume they go back to the previous year's estimates for comparison, and build up from that. But how many years back do they go in preparing the current year's estimates, and if consideration is given to the actual expenditures of the current year as compared with the estimates of previous years, how far back do they go in comparing the figures in order to arrive at their current year's needs?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The current year's needs have to be judged in the light of what the public service requires currently, and at the same time if you have your department spending $100 million in one year, and it has been running like that for three, four or five years, it is unlikely that they would be asking for a very substantial increase in their annual grant, unless there was a matter of great public policy involved which would require an expenditure out of all proportion in that year.

The Treasury Board is a continuing body both in the sense of the minister and the staff that do the work, and there is a memory as well as a record of all the various additional expenditures which are proposed from time to time by the departments, the result being that you are not likely to find that a department would obtain this year all the money which they think they ought to have, and there will be a reserve list for consideration another year.

Mr. MONTEITH: For instance, under Administration, there are not only the employees set down, but the figures for the two years, 1954-55 and 1955-56, and the number of employees listed with their required salaries, and down below there are the several sundry items to other departmental officials in preparing their own department's estimates, for instance, in comparing the actual expenditures and those of any prior years.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Oh yes, they do that all the time.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I would like to be told something more about the operations of the Treasury Board. I would like to know what happens at these Treasury Board meetings. It is no disrespect to the ministers who are there to say that unless they are a combination of geniuses they are not going to make much of a contribution to this work except to apply their judgments. I am not going to say they are rubber stamps but they are there to put their imprimatur on what is done.

Take the Minister of Finance, for example. He has one hundred and one things to do, and I cannot believe that he is going to have the time to make such an investigation as would enable him when it is over to feel that he has personally been completely satisfied as to the details. But there must be someone—or at least I assume there is someone—who is responsible for that. Who is the person who makes the recommendations? Somebody must do that. It cannot be the result of the assessments of the ministers who come in "on the fly".

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You should not underestimate the ability of anyone to do anything, Mr. Macdonnell.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I am ready to be corrected on that but I still submit that what I have said is substantially true. These men are giving a short period out of their very busy lives to attend this Treasury Board and I doubt very much that they are able to probe very far into this situation. They have surely to depend on the general results of the work of other people appearing before them.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The Treasury Board is a statutory body charged with certain responsibilities and they discharge this responsibility. They do not come in "on the fly". They make a serious job of it and put in a lot of work during the months of September, October, November and, sometimes, January. It is not a "rubber stamp" job.

Mr. REGIER: Could we know who the members of the Treasury Board are?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, I can produce the order in council.

Mr. MONTEITH: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question on the mechanics of the preparation of the departmental estimates. What is the starting point and how is it worked up from there?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The starting point is the department which receives the letter. They have their own treasury officers and there are also treasury officials attached to them from the Finance department. They present the estimates, they are signed by the deputy minister—

Mr. MONTEITH: No—up to that point. Where is the starting point with regard to the preparation of these estimates and the mechanics of preparing the estimates of each department?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: In the department.

Mr. MONTEITH: What is the starting point?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The deputy minister who directs that it should be done.

Mr. MONTEITH: He directs that it should be done. Where do they start? Do they start with the previous year's estimates and work up, or do they start out in blank for the year.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I do not think you should expect that the government would ignore the experience of the past. But I can only speak for the Finance department; I am not here to explain the workings of other departments. The Finance department has certain obligations to discharge. Account is taken of these obligations in the estimates, and having done that they have to have consideration for the expenditure of prior years.

In reply to the question I was asked earlier, the Treasury Board consists of Mr. Garson, Mr. Lapointe, Mr. Gregg, Mr. McCann, Mr. Marler and myself. I should add, however, that all members of the cabinet are ex officio members of the Treasury Board, and that different ministers attend at different times when particular matters are being discussed, and it would be a rare meeting of the Treasury Board which would not be attended by ministers other than those I have named.

Mr. REGIER: What was the date of that order in council?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I could not give you the date. They change from time to time.

Mr. ARGUE: Can you give the committee some idea of the technical people who are usually present at a Treasury Board meeting? Is the deputy minister of Finance usually present?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I am referring now to the preparation of estimates, which is what I was asked about. The persons present would be the secretary of the Treasury Board, Mr. Deutsch and one or two—perhaps three—of his officials on behalf of the Department of Finance. The department concerned whose estimates are being considered, will have present as a rule—in fact, invariably—the minister, the deputy minister, and usually the principal directors or senior officials whose items are under discussion.

Mr. REGIER: Do I take it that the Treasury Board more or less went over the draft of this whole blue book of estimates, yet when we ask the minister who are the few members of the Treasury Board he has to look it up to see who they are?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The reason I asked for the detail was, as I said, that the composition of the board changes from time to time and indeed, as I indicated, more ministers attend than are on the official lists and it is unusual to have only the ministers whose names are actually printed appearing at a meeting.

Mr. NESBITT: To follow up the questions asked by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell)—perhaps I can make my meaning clear by using an example. Let us, for instance, say that the Minister of Agriculture presents his estimates before the Treasury Board. Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell us what actually happens in practice. Are those estimates examined by the Minister of Finance's experts or by the members of the Treasury Board? Does the Minister of Transport look into these estimates personally, and have his experts look into them, or does he rely on the decision made by the Finance department?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is not a decision of the Finance department. The Treasury Board, as such, has a staff; there is a Treasury Board staff of which the secretary is Mr. Deutsch and they do the examination and they are the ones who speak on behalf of the Treasury Board on this examination.

Mr. NESBITT: And then they make a recommendation to the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right.

Mr. NESBITT: And the members of the Treasury Board after hearing representations from the minister concerned and after hearing the representations of the staff of the Department of Finance pass judgment?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. HAHN: The suggestion was made earlier, I understood, that a comparison is made in some degree with the estimates of past years in order to discover whether or not there are differences in expenditure. Sometimes, however, the initial expenditure in a previous year arose out of necessity

because of some extenuating circumstance. How often is a re-examination made of each individual item with respect to determining whether an expenditure is warranted?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: What type of item do you have in mind?

Mr. HAHN: To take one example, the rent of a particular building may be $6,000 a year which would appear under the estimates of the Department of Public Works. This initial expenditure was required because of the fact that the department needed a building and the only one they could find was the one at $6,000 a year, so they signed a contract for a lease of two or three years. After that period has expired the question of the rent becomes a matter for comparison. How often is that re-examination made?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The responsibility for that would rest with the department concerned, either the Department of Public Works or the department which is renting the space. Once a lease has been negotiated for a fixed period of time it would not be a matter of concern to the Treasury Board until, of course, the lease came up for renewal.

Mr. HAHN: Would they re-examine it at the time of renewal?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Oh yes, we do that regularly.

Mr. HAHN: What examination would the minister's department make upon that request being placed before them?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: In this particular case, quite an extensive examination.

Mr. MONTEITH: There does appear to have been that supplementary estimate for a lesser amount possibly. This is a major one and I can understand there would be quite an examination of it. This is for purposes of a loan. As far as the estimates go it is an outlay. Is that right.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: The Treasury Board would sit on that and that would be subsequent to the meeting held from October to early January?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: In other words, the Treasury Board has subsequent meetings on these supplementary estimates?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to ask a further question on the actual details. Naturally, the minister can only speak for his own department, but if I might refer to item 112 in the details on page 190, just for argument we will take any one item and here is one "Publication of Estimates". In 1955-56 it is estimated to be $20,000; in 1954-55 the estimate required at that time appeared to be $22,000. Now, when the officials of the department start out originally to arrive at their estimates I am assuming that the first figure they look at is the estimate of last year. Would they then look at the figure actually spent last year or both; do they compare the possible requirements with this year as well as what was spent last year?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They do all three, and if there is any noticeable variation they will examine previous years to see why the variation.

Mr. MONTEITH: But unless there is any variation they start with the previous year?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They start with the estimate in the previous year and the expenditure.

Mr. HAHN: Is there a basic formula for the rental paid on buildings?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: When these matters come before the Treasury Board—although once again we are getting into a weekly Treasury Board meeting and not an estimates Treasury Board—there is always an examination into the

prevailing rental in the town in question. If the leasing is going at $3 a foot we have to be informed whether that is high, low, or nominal in that particular area.

Mr. ARGUE: Does the cabinet or the Prime Minister lay down a general policy for the Treasury Board to follow? Does it say, "Well now, this year for various reasons"—defence appropriation perhaps—we have to look extremely carefully at the estimates and hold them down"; and in another year will it say, "Perhaps we can look into the expansion of the estimates of various departments." Is there some kind of a general attitude decided by the Treasury Board or by the cabinet for the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I do not think you would expect me to discuss any cabinet decisions here. But the Minister of Finance is responsible for the preparation of the estimates under his supervision and is also charged with the responsibility of raising the taxes necessary to meet the expenditures. I think in every instance you will understand the Minister of Finance wishes to keep the expenditures down.

Mr. ARGUE: The prevailing attitude has been to keep expenditures down.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. REGIER: Is the minister saying that the Treasury Board is responsible to the minister or to the cabinet as a whole?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It amounts to the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will leave item 112 open if you are satisfied to do so.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Please do not close it yet.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not closing it. What I was going to say was we would pass on to item 113 and leave 112 open and that in that way it may be easier to cover the items. Then if there is some general question arising out of specific items we can come back to it at the end, if that is satisfactory to the committee.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I wonder if we could just follow it through for a moment on this point which are on now.

Mr. REGIER: I would like to ask a question on the detailed matter on item 112.

The CHAIRMAN: We could take that and any further detailed questioning before we pass to the next item.

Mr. REGIER: I have made several observations on these people listed as executive assistants to the minister. I noticed here one executive assistant to the Minister of Finance. I know the responsibilities which the minister has and that the country is willing to pay for all executive assistance which he needs as Minister of Finance. However, some of the executive assistants seem to have very little to do with the actual work of the minister. Could the minister outline to the committee exactly what the responsibilities are of his executive assistant? I know I cannot hold him responsible for the others.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I am sorry, I have not got one. There is a provision in the establishment for one, but there is not one. We are saving money.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I am still not quite clear where the initiative lies. We have been told about senior officials who I take it are part of the Finance Department set-up who really have special responsibilities in connection with the scrutinizing of the estimates. Would one of these officials be quite free to initiate just on his own? What I have in mind is this: I have a little fixation that the only way economies are made is for someone to tell people they have this much to spend and no more. That is the way I believe economies are made in private business. I am not suggesting that

any civil servants be fired, but I am suggesting that if there is the closest scrutiny expenditures have more chance of being cut down. Would the senior official in charge be quite free to come to the Treasury Board and say: I think such and such and such a department could get on with $3 or $4 million less if they had to?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You mean the officials of the Treasury Board?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Yes.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is their duty to say that to me if they think it a fact. It is not only their duty but their daily practice.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Does the organization which is trying to reduce expenditures set itself targets or tasks regardless of the wishes of the departments? When I say "regardless" of course you cannot ignore them entirely. But do you proceed on the basis of looking at a certain department and what it is doing and try to reach a conclusion that it could do with $500,000 or $5 million less and hold them to that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I do not think that is quite the approach although it may be the result. The approach is more detailed. Every item of the estimates as presented by a department is tested by the Treasury Board to see in fact if it can get on with less.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): In that extract I read this morning from the Winnipeg *Free Press*, what would happen there? Would that detail come before the Treasury Board and would they know that it was a bridge at Ivy Lea and that the ferry perhaps was doing a good deal less. Would they go into that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: All that is in the daily grist of the Treasury Board.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): So when we find this happening, according to the Winnipeg *Free Press*, we must not blame the Customs department but we must blame the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, blame the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Well, that is an unrewarding kind of game. That is very easy to do, but I do not think it gets one anywhere. You have to get a little lower down and spread further out—

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I thought I put it at the very lowest level, if you want to use that term. When they are taken to the deputy minister of the department concerned he would have to justify the expenditure of that amount which has to be approved or disapproved by the Civil Service Commission, and then receive the approval of the Treasury Board. That is all done and in the detail you describe.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): In the *Free Press* you have a competent person who cannot be regarded from any knowledge I have as unsympathetic towards this government who makes this astounding statement; at least, I think it is astounding.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Why don't you rely on your own observation of this thing?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Because it is not adequate and because in some cases I might rush into conclusions based on too little evidence. We are inclined to talk about government servants as if they did not work as hard as the rest of us. We know that some of them in the upper strata work very hard indeed and perhaps in the lower strata too. I do not like these generalizations because they can be so unjust. But I do still feel the picture that the minister gives of this group of ministers—with deference—I still feel that this group with others coming in and out (which in my way of thinking does not add to the strength but lessens the strength by lessening the sense

of responsibility of each individual will not be very effective—I find it difficult to believe that that group will apply itself adequately to the details; it is not my idea of organization.

Mr. MACNAUGHT: What other system would you suggest?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): May I please complete my statement? I was just going to say that it is not my idea of organization. There should be heavier responsibility at the level below—people, to my way of thinking, who do know the details.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I do not think you would want to invest in any person below the rank of minister a veto on the estimates of another minister.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): No.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Having said that you would have to agree that the present procedure is the only one that can be adopted.

Mr. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we have an appropriation of $7,500 for the executive assistant to the Minister of Finance which he does not anticipate using, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right.

Mr. HAHN: What is the purpose of including it in the estimates if you have no desire to have one?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Not to spend the money, anyway.

Mr. REGIER: To pursue that point a little further, the minister tells us that every detail is carefully examined to see what can be eliminated, and if one of our hardest working ministers finds that he does not need an executive assistant might it not be good to eliminate those who spend their days in the cafeteria and are known as executive assistants—

An Hon. MEMBER: That is not fair.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I happen to have a staff which is probably larger in the general sense than any other minister simply because of the all pervading work of the Department of Finance and when the estimates were being made up I did not feel, at that time anyway, that we would require the assistance of an executive assistant; but that is not to say that I might not decide otherwise during the year; that is why it was left as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. MONTEITH: The minister mentioned earlier that apparently he sends out officers from his department to assist other departments in preparing their estimates—

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I did not want to give that impression. There are officers of the Treasury department stationed in the offices of the other departments at all times.

Mr. MONTEITH: Well, on page 189 in the details of item 112, there are several finance officers listed and I notice there were 54 of them in 1954-55 and there were 67 in 1955-56. Are those the particular officials you mentioned who are stationed there all the time?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Could we complete the general discussion and then come to the details?

Mr. MONTEITH: All right. I was referring to the statement I understood the minister had made that he had officials out in other departments.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We have members of the Treasury Branch in every branch of government.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would those be the finance officers listed here?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: These are personnel of the Comptroller of the Treasury and not of the Treasury Board.

Mr. MONTEITH: The Treasury Board has officials out—

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, it is the Comptroller of the Treasury who has the officials out.

Mr. MONTEITH: And these are officials of the Comptroller of the Treasury?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Right.

Mr. MONTEITH: Are these the officials—some of them at least—about whom you spoke as being out in other departments?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Perhaps I confused the committee. The persons who are in the various departments are Treasury officers of the Comptroller of the Treasury.

Mr. MONTEITH: And are they paid by the comptroller or by the department?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They are paid by the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board is a branch of the Finance department situated physically within our building and in our staff and they do not have representatives in the other departments.

Mr. MONTEITH: I am not quite clear on this. This has nothing to do with the details of item 112 of the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This is general administration.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would these officers whom the Comptroller of the Treasury has stationed in the other departments be listed in item 112?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, they are listed in item 113.

Mr. MONTEITH: Item 112 indicates that the finance officers increased from 54 to 67?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MONTEITH: Why is that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Once again do you want to pursue that or is that in administration, because I would like to conclude the general discussion if we could.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Does the Comptroller of the Treasury sit on the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No.

Mr. NESBITT: I wish to follow the line of questioning Mr. Monteith was pursuing concerning the Treasury officers stationed in the other departments. Could the minister tell us exactly what their function is? Is it of an advisory nature or are they watch dogs?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They are in effect watch dogs to see that the money is spent in accordance with the terms of the vote.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I would like to ask if the minister will be here at the next meeting because I want to raise a question which I think is important and which is frequently raised by us in the House relating to the employment of outside efficiency experts. I would like to know if the minister will be at our next meeting.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I will leave that open for the moment and proceed to another question. It is not immediately obvious to me why the Comptroller of the Treasury does not sit with the Treasury Board. I am relying on the similarity of the words, but from the little I have seen of the

Comptroller of the Treasury in action he is the man who sees whether the decisions of the Treasury Board are carried out.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, and the decisions of parliament.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I ran into that in connection with a departmental expenditure. It is not considered necessary that he share in any way in the making of the decision, he just supervises the carrying out of decisions?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Correct.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Is it arguable that he should sit on the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Anything is arguable. But what will he contribute? His function is to see that the decisions are carried out and not to contribute to the making of the decisions.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I suppose in most cases it is a question of interpreting a statute or an order in council and you may argue that way, but the argument on the other side would be that if there is a question of interpretation if a man had been present when a decision was made he might understand it better. I am not pressing that, however.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think your point is partially met by the other functioning of the Treasury Board. Should there be an expenditure made or one contemplated being made, if the expenditure does not appear to come within the authority of the Treasury Board or parliament the Comptroller of the Treasury may of course advise the Treasury Board as to the method of proceeding which would give authority to the expected expenditure within any authority made prior to that.

Mr. MCWILLIAM: Mr. Chairman, may I ask since it is almost 1:00 o'clock, and we are going to rise for lunch anyway, would it not be possible to change our room, in view of the construction work which is going on outside?

The CHAIRMAN: We took this room because we thought that it would be the coolest room of all. But we shall have to get another one even it it is not so cool. Room 497 would be very hot. On the other hand, the acoustics in room 277 are not good, but I believe we would rather put up with them than stand this noise. So when we adjourn I suggest we meet this afternoon in room 277, where we will not have to compete with all this hammering outside. Are there any other detailed questions on item 112?

Mr. MONTEITH: I have one or two.

Mr. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, could you not arrange to have the committee set up with a dais, because we find it much better if the head table is raised.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall try to arrange it. Are there any other detailed questions on item 112?

Mr. MONTEITH: May I ask for an explanation of the increase in finance officers from 54 to 67. That is on page 189.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Perhaps if there are any similar questions I could get the answers for you at 2:00 o'clock or whenever we reconvene.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of detail on item 112?

Mr. MONTEITH: I have another one. On page 189 at the foot of the page, having to do with clerks, I notice there are a fewer number required in 1955-56; while there are more office appliance operators. Is that because of gradual mechanization of the accounting system?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is true. If you require more details, we can supply them.

Mr. MONTEITH: No. I just wanted to know if that was true.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is true.

Mr. MONTEITH: And this "Rental of Office Equipment", what is that for?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is "IBM".

The CHAIRMAN: Subject to getting the answers which the minister will give to Mr. Monteith, we shall start with the item 113, and we shall resume at 3:00 o'clock.

113. Comptroller of the Treasury—Central Office and Branch Offices Administration, $15,616,300.

Mr. MONTEITH: What type of travelling does the department do? I notice there is an item of $30,000.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We have, as I think you know, a branch of the department particularly concerned with international trade treaties and the like, and they run up a considerable part of this item going to conferences of one kind or another; and the treasury officers we have been discussing, of the Comptroller of the Treasury, are situated in all the principal cities of Canada, and they travel back and forth in the course of their business.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Well, we can go into that matter this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: I might mention that we were supposed to have notices out for a meeting at 8 o'clock this evening as well as for 3 o'clock this afternoon. I am just advising the committee of this now. So we shall meet at 3 o'clock in room 277, and also at 8 o'clock tonight.

AFTERNOON SESSION

JULY 5, 1955.
3:00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. We are still on item 112 for two or three answers yet to be given.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: First is the answer to the question asked by Mr. Monteith about finance officers. These are not particular members. It is only a rank by designation in the department. It happens that between the two years we have promoted some juniors to this branch. That is why you will have more of them than you had in the preceding year. There have been a few added as additional personnel too.

Mr. MONTEITH: Departmental accountants and administrative officers move up, or something like that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: You had another question, Mr. Macdonnell?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): It was a question which was debated in the House, but there is no reason why we cannot mention it here, and that is the question which we raised as to the bringing in of outside expert efficiency assistants to examine the work of our government departments, as has been done in some cases, notably the post office and I think the film board. I do not want to take up the time of the committee to argue it, but I would like to ask the minister whether he does not think it might be a useful thing to have efficiency experts who are constantly employed by private industry, employed by every government department other than those for which you have already employed them. Perhaps the minister would first of all say what is his impression of these reports which have been received. Were

they useful, and if so were those departments in some way especially subject to that sort of thing? Do they differ entirely from other departments?

To me it is a prima facie case that people who are regarded as sufficiently efficient to assist private enterprise in reviewing its operations might also be useful in the case of public departments.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: There is a difference between the vote which I gave in the House not long ago rejecting the proposals made by the party to which Mr. Macdonnell belongs with respect to a general over-all scrutiny of all departments of government on the one hand, and making a particular scrutiny at a particular time for a particular reason, on the other hand. The post office and the film board fell within the latter group. There was some reason for this. There was public need at the moment in a number of these departments, and consideration was given to the appointment of one or two of the business firms that he has in mind. I see no reason why the government would not continue that practice as the need arose, but I say that is a wholly different thing from an over-all plan which I think Mr. Macdonnell has in mind.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): The minister said that these inquiries were made because of a public need at the moment. That seems a fairly reasonably view. But how is the public need at the moment determined, and how does the minister determine that there is no public need at the moment in a multitude of other departments which have not been so reviewed?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We are only discussing my own department. I do not think there is need for it in that department.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): There, Mr. Chairman, the question arises at once. I thought that when we were considering the estimates of the department which, from my point of view, can be argued to be supervisory of the efficiency of all departments, because it determines the moneys which they get—I thought it would be fair to ask the minister whether he did not think that it might be investigated. The minister answered that he answers only for his own department.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes. You would not expect me to say that any other department ought to be investigated.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): It is a little difficult for me to put it just that way.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Is there any other way?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Yes. I think it would be quite competent for the minister as the watch dog of the treasury and charged with the duty along with others, of determining what other departments should spend, in other words, determining whether they are efficient; I would think that it would be quite competent for the minister to say that public need at the moment demanded that a particular department be looked into.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think you have to make a better case for it than just to say it.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I admit that I am only making a prima facie case, and I make it in this very simple way: that it has not been done, and I think that it would be fair to say that the ordinary, large private enterprise might be regarded as just as alert to achieve efficiency as a government department. I think that it is a fair statement, and that it is very common practice in large business to have an open mind, indeed, to desire to have fresh minds come in and look at what they are doing. These efficiency companies would not exist if that was not very common practice, and we all know that it is.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, but would they not start off with a condition to which their attention was specifically directed? Would it not be because of an investigation as to whether an expansion should or should not take place in certain respects, or how it would affect the rest of the company, or alternatively, that the company found its development to be thwarted in this respect, or its sales; wouldn't there be some underlying reason?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I think the minister has suggested what would be reasonable as a special reason, but I suggest, and I believe that such investigations are often made not because of any specific thing at the moment, but just because it was felt that it would be a good thing to get some fresh minds to deal with it; and may I say with whatever humility is necessary that the occasion for it being suggested is that we in the opposition venture to suggest every year that every department should be better administrated than it is.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We will continue to give your recommendation consideration.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: It seems to me that since the minister considers that the management is good, that is the answer to the question you raise. You do not make any specific charge; it is just a general statement that you think they should call in efficiency experts. But I do not see any need proved here in front of this committee yet.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I do not think it necessary to prove any need.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Perhaps we could agree on the general propositions that these business firms are useful in their own field.

Mr. ENFIELD: Does the Treasury Board initiate such investigation?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No.

Mr. HAHN: Under what circumstances did we find before that we had a need for any investigation?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You would have to ask the departments concerned.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Perhaps the minister will consider the matter and discuss it again in the committee of the whole House, because I think it is very interesting. When we purported to have a debate about it in the House, it was not a debate; it was a one-sided show, and we got no answer to our argument. So with deference I do not think that the minister has answered me this afternoon, but I do not propose to pursue it at the moment. My point is that a prima facie case has been made, and if my friend says there is no prima facie case, then we will not get very much further.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I think we have the benefit of the doubt. Let us put it that way.

The CHAIRMAN: The government thinks there is a difference in the point of view. The government thinks that its general administration is very satisfactory, while there might be special cases which could be looked into. But you, as an opposition feel that the general administration is not satisfactory and that everything should be looked into. But that situation might change. If by chance, you became the government, your attitude would, I suggest, be reversed by that very fact.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would. You would be running the administration. The minister admits that any special circumstances which seemed to warrant it might be investigated, and that is as far as you would go, if you were running the administration.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): It leaves me in a very unsatisfactory position, because the minister admits there are special circumstances, but he will not tell us what they are.

The CHAIRMAN: They are shown from time to time by the committee dealing with such cases.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I say there is a prima facie case because with all due deference to the ministers as heads of departments, they are different from ordinary business men. They are not trained up from youth to the job they are in. We are thankful that they do as well as they do; nevertheless they are different from the heads of business institutions in as much as they have not been trained to it. I always think we ought to be grateful to Providence when people who have not been trained to a task are good administrators. I do not think we have any right to except it automatically. I say therefore there is a prima facie case for having the very best investigation we can have to look into our organizations. The cost would be trifling compared to the money being spent. My experience is that it is always the best way to submit what we are doing to others whom we consider to be able, and from whom we are only too ready to learn.

Mr. NESBITT: In that regard, as Mr. Macdonnell pointed out, it may be an answer, as the minister said, that things are going very well, and that there is no specific incident in particular. However, this committee is in no position. We cannot call witnesses and go out and examine the detailed workings of government departments. It may be that the minister would recommend that we try to have a committee of experts—so called efficiency experts—go into one department of government as an experiment to see what recommendations might be made. There might be some very substantial savings indeed. I do not think that it is appropriate to say that each department should be discussed in the committee of the whole, or before this committee this year because we have not any authority to go into the workings, and we cannot call witnesses. Maybe the minister would consider it that way.

Mr. CANNON: With all due deference to the hon. member for Greenwood, as a lawyer I do not think he has made out a prima facie case at all. He simply has made a statement and says that it might be a good thing to have an investigation; but that is not making out a prima facie case.

The CHAIRMAN: Might I suggest to the committee that it has a chance here to see to what extent the Department of Finance through the branch headed by the Comptroller of the Treasury does keep a continual eye on the functions of the various departments. That is the next item and I would suggest to the committee that questions as to the extent to which this supervision is carried out through the Comptroller of the Treasury and his officials might well be gone into then, and if at that point it is demonstrated that a very efficient watch is not kept, then Mr. Macdonnell's questions will have gone some distance in proving the necessity for some independent body being brought in.

But we are paying now for a body which has officials in every department to watch over these things, and I suggest that we consider the next item, Item 113, on which questions could be asked as to the extent to which this continual watch is being kept on behalf of parliament by the Comptroller of the Treasury and his officials. It will then be clear if there is anything in Mr. Macdonnell's questions. I suggest that what he is asking really comes under Item 113 and that we should go on to that item, and if there is anything further which Mr. Macdonnell thinks should be done under that particular branch of administration we could ask the minister about it.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I don't suppose it would be possible—I had the idea because Mr. Walter Gordon is himself an efficiency expert—to broaden the terms of reference of his commission so that he might begin by taking a look at the operations of government?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You don't suppose that, do you?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I am not familiar in detail with the terms of reference—I am asking the minister whether he thinks it would be possible.

The CHAIRMAN: I made the remarks I did because I think we should keep within our terms of reference with regard to the examination of the estimates. Mr. Macdonnell was getting very close to opening up a question which has already been decided in the House, so I suggest that unless there are some further questions on Item 112 we should proceed to Item 113.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I am glad to note that the minister has not entirely ruled out my suggestion.

Mr. THATCHER: I have one comment to make on the subject. I see that within the last two or three months the Americans have had a special Committee going into their government set-up, and that it has made some rather startling recommendations. I am wondering whether anyone in the Treasury Board or in the department is scrutinizing these recommendations, and analysing them to see if they might be usefully put into effect in Canada.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The minister is, among others.

Mr. THATCHER: You have not asked anyone in your department who has more time, to study this matter?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think it is compulsory reading for quite a few people.

Mr. THATCHER: I have one more question, Mr. Chairman. It might have been answered this morning while I was not here, and if so it may be ignored. I would like to ask a question about our civil servants. I know that the minister has made quite a number of speeches around the country expressing concern about the way in which the civil service has been growing. I would like to know what the present policy is with respect to the number of civil servants. Is there any specific policy of keeping the level down? Are there any "ceilings" affecting the numbers to be employed?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: A ceiling was established in the blue book and we have been trying to adhere to that since it was published in January of this year. We are trying—on the whole successfully—to "freeze" the strength of the various departments in accordance with the establishment set out in the blue book. There have been some additions since we made up the strength last Fall and Winter but on the whole we have been holding the line very well so far this year.

Mr. THATCHER: Is the rate of growth of the overall Civil Service decreasing, at least?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I will have to get the figures for the past six months in order to see if the numbers are growing, but I am quite sure they will not be growing at the rate they were last year.

Mr. THATCHER: Have the different departments got numerical ceilings over which they are not permitted to go?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right. The ceilings in the blue book.

Mr. MONTEITH: I think the minister mentioned this morning that these finance officers are distributed around the country.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I was referring—

Mr. MONTEITH: To the next item. I see. These are simply finance people in your own department.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take the next item then. Item 113, details on page 190. We dealt with it briefly at the close of this morning's meeting.

Mr. NESBITT: Is it permissible to ask detailed questions? On page 190, at the bottom of the page, and at the top of page 191 it is shown that there had been an increase in the number of certain grades of treasury officers. For instance, grade two treasury officers are increased by three to 136, and grade three from 65 to 88. The number of treasury officers grade one has increased from 159 to 190. I was wondering whether the minister could give us a rough idea of the duties of these various types of treasury officials and possibly give the committee some reason for the increase in these particular grades.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I cannot define the duties of treasury officers grades one or two. I would have to ask one of the staff to answer that.

Mr. B. G. MCINTYRE (*Comptroller of Treasury*): The duties of the treasury officers differ from grade to grade. For example, if you go down to grade one treasury officers you will find them referred to as holding junior supervisory positions. The next higher grade has more senior responsibilities. The highest grades are held by the chiefs of the divisions in the large departments. In the intermediate grades you might find employees who are assistants in the larger divisions but in the other divisions they are the chiefs because the departmental division is not large enough to warrant a higher grade.

Mr. NESBITT: Perhaps I might be able to facilitate the matter if I asked some specific questions. For instance, can you tell us specifically what are the duties of a treasury officer grade thirteen?

Mr. MCINTYRE: A treasury officer grade thirteen is an officer in charge of our organization in the Department of National Defence, for example, which is a very important and active department at the present time. Another is in the Department of Transport, and a third will be found in the Central Pay Office where we handle the accounts for payment of some 110,000 of the salaried employees of the government service and, in addition to that by machine methods provide a detailed accounting service for most of the large departments.

Mr. NESBITT: In the first example you cited—that of the grade 13 treasury officer in the Department of National Defence—how many people from the Treasury Department would you have in that department?

Mr. MCINTYRE: One.

Mr. NESBITT: He is the treasury watchdog, so to speak, in that department.

Mr. MCINTYRE: He is the chief.

Mr. NESBITT: Are there any other treasury officials in that Department of National Defence of another grade?

Mr. MCINTYRE: Oh, yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Such as, for example?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: There are actually in the Department of National Defence 912 treasury officers.

Mr. MCINTYRE: I may say that that figure of 912 refers to all the clerks as well as to the treasury officials. We have in the Department of National Defence some dozen officers across Canada and in each of these district offices there is a treasury officer of a particular grade and he will have an assistant, in that office, of a lower grade; there may be four or five depending on the size of the office.

Mr. NESBITT: Let us take, for example a treasury officer grade 7, in which grade I see the numbers have increased from 22 to 36 this year. Can you tell us what are the specific duties of a grade 7 treasury officer?

Mr. McINTYRE: An important example of a treasury officer grade 7 is the district treasury officer in charge of the Halifax Dock Yard Accounts at Halifax. He has charge of possibly 60 employees.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you hear at the back, Mr. Dupuis?

Mr. DUPUIS: Not very well.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you speak a little louder, Mr. McIntyre, please.

Mr. NESBITT: These treasury officers actually supervise the paying of accounts, the purchases made and so on?

Mr. McINTYRE: They check on the authority to pay; they see that there are funds available from which payments may be made and that the payment is in accordance with any executive order that might apply.

Mr. NESBITT: Can you tell us—perhaps this question would be better addressed to the minister—if the considerable increase of treasury officers grade 7, grade 3 and grade 1 is necessary?

Mr. McINTYRE: Part of that increase comes by including in the details of this year's estimate provision for the National Harbours Board staff which heretofore was not included in the details on the estimates because the National Harbours Board reimbursed us for the full cost of the treasury services, and as estimates were prepared in each department there was no provision made in our own estimates and no numbers shown in the estimates, but this year in view of the estimates that we are presenting to parliament constituting the establishment of the different departments it is vitally necessary to include them in the estimates.

Mr. NESBITT: In previous years, Mr. McIntyre, who acted as the watchdogs of the treasury in the National Harbours Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The same people were there. The only difference is that heretofore the National Harbours Board has paid us the full amount of their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN: On page 192 of the Estimates that sum of $220,950 is taken out, being the money reimbursed by the National Harbours Board.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Are they going to continue to do that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We are still getting paid for that.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: There would seem to be no provision for a chief treasury officer, National Health and Welfare. There must be some reason for that. Is it economy?

Mr. McINTYRE: That is because of reclassification under a different grade.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness could tell us to what extent the Treasury Board goes into the activities of the various Crown corporations? Do you bother with them at all?

Mr. McINTYRE: Our office is not concerned in the financial operations of Crown corporations.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They have their own auditing.

Mr. McINTYRE: Except to the extent they may be drawing funds from the monetary fund. If parliament has appropriated funds for the purpose of the Crown corporations payment is made through us.

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice half way down page 192 "Casuals and Others", last year there was an estimate amounting to $70,000 and this year it is $319,620, I wonder what the reason would be for that large increase?

Mr. McINTYRE: The principal reason for that increase may be found in the two items above. You will notice there that $315,000 is deducted as anticipated savings due to staff turnover. We always had that latitude in

the past because no such deduction was made. That latitude had proven sufficient to cover any casuals we required on various matters beyond the $70,000. But with the reduction of $315,000 there we had to make this special provision for casuals and others.

Mr. MONTEITH: What type of person would be considered casual in the department? Do you hire any summer help or student help?

Mr. MCINTYRE: The bulk of the staff in casuals are to be found in our unemployment insurance offices during the winter months processing the cash vouchers as well as the warrants which have been issued to the recipients of unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to direct a question to the minister. Mr. McIntyre just stated that Treasury Board officials do not in any way go into the activities of Crown corporations. In view of the fact that no parliamentary committee goes into them either, just where is the supervision? Is there not some government body which does go into the balance sheets of these Crown corporations?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The control of the Crown corporations from the standpoint of spending is through the auditors. As to their budgets they are approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. THATCHER: Is that not a loose control? Why should the Treasury Board not check them also?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It would be a duplication of services being rendered by the auditor.

Mr. THATCHER: The point I am trying to establish is that all these Crown corporations report neither to a parliamentary committee nor to the Treasury Board. How is the taxpayer's equity in them being controlled?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The auditor does the internal audit. The annual statement is always tabled in parliament and it is a definition of the activities during that year and you are entitled to criticize it if you desire to do so. What other supervision have you in mind?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): How are their board of directors made up?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I presume I could get that for you in every case.

Mr. THATCHER: It seems to me that as the taxpayers invest very substantial sums of money in these Crown corporations, the Crown corporations should be reported to somebdy.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We table the annual report every year and it is subject to criticism in the House on the items where we vote money for them. If we do not vote money for them you would have to take it up in the estimates of the department which accepts responsibility for tabling. Do not confuse the Treasury Board and the Comptroller of the Treasury. The Comptroller of the Treasury is going through the accounts of the spending departments to see that they are spending in accordance with the vote parliament has given them. That is an internal arrangement in Crown corporations and presumably the directors of the corporation are going to see that similar supervision is provided. You would not expect the Treasury Board to treat the Crown corporations as we do other departments in the sense of reducing their expenditures because we are not in a position to tell the directors what they should do in carrying out their business in the coming year.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on item 113?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I have just one further question about Crown corporations. Some of them have a certain relationship to Defence Production. They do report to some minister or other?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Can you give us the chief one?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I would have to get a list and put it in the record for you. They are all established by statute and the minister is designated in the statute. If you would care to look at the public accounts, volume 2 of 1954, you will find the financial statements of Crown corporations listed with the responsible minister.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Well then, it is quite true there are boards of directors. Perhaps the minister could say to what extent they are made up of senior civil servants. It is quite true that there are auditors, but I would imagine also that the minister does have some power relative to the Crown corporation under his particular supervision.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The only two I have are the Bank of Canada and the Industrial Development Bank. I would be glad to answer questions about those two but not the others under the responsibility of other ministers.

Mr. MONTEITH: On item 113 I notice there has been a trend to increase the estimates for this particular item. In 1954 it was $13,605,000 odd, in 1955 $15,195,000 odd and this year $15,616,000 odd. Now it has jumped from $13,605,000 in 1954 to $15,600,000 odd this year. Could we have an explanation of the chief reason for that?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: There have been annual increases in salaries for the 4,000 odd employees which represents a very large part of the increase.

Mr. REGIER: I am looking at the wages being paid to these officials. I wonder if the minister could give us an idea of the approximate turnover annually in the civil service? That is, those of the civil service in the employ of the Department of Finance. Is it 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 30 per cent turnover annually?

Mr. MCINTYRE: The turnover in the civil service generally varies according to the composition of the staff. I would say that the turnover in my organization has been abnormally high because of the proportion of female employees who resign to be married or for other reasons. In 1953 we had a turnover of 873 employees and in 1954 it dropped to 735 employees.

Mr. REGIER: I should like to follow that through. We sometimes hear it said that with respect to the departmental officials who do auditing in the public utilities and so on and other levels of government, if they are topnotchers and are found to be such by the company whose books they are examining, the governments run into difficulty as they continually have to let these men go because the company itself is offering these men a higher rate of pay. Could this be said to apply to your level of government as well, that with respect to those finance officials, who come into contact through their work with private enterprise, that we the people of Canada are losing the services of some of these men because of higher rates of pay.

Mr. MCINTYRE: Perhaps the committee would be interested in some details of the 735 reduction in 1954. 131 resigned to better their position. 80 resigned on account of marriage. 113 resigned for domestic reasons. 98 resigned for miscellaneous reasons and 21 resigned upon entering the armed forces. Those are the resignations totalling 443 in 1954. Then we had 37 who retired. 160 were transferred to other branches of the government service. 22 were laid off and 57 were released through other causes.

Item agreed to.

114. Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Administration, $465,394.

The CHAIRMAN: The details of item 114 are to be found on page 193.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Mr. Chairman, when we say an item is carried here we are not precluding any kind of discussion when we get into committee of the whole.

The CHAIRMAN: The only thought is that if things are gone into very closely here it will not be repeated all over again in the House.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): That is a reasonable hope.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point raised you will remember the resolution of reference, "Reserving all the rights in committee of supply."

Mr. MONTEITH: I notice the estimates in this vote changed from $465,000 last year to $574,000 this year. That cannot all be increases in salaries. It is over twice as much as it was in 1954. Is the extension of some branch being included here?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The increase for salaries between last year and this year is $121,000. The additional here is because we have just about doubled the number of benefits we are to have by the Superannuation Act.

Mr. MONTEITH: That would be chiefly by this Act that was put in?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Item agreed to.

115. The Bank Act—Salaries and expenses of the Inspector General of Banks' Office, $35,670.

The CHAIRMAN: The details are on page 193.

Mr. HAHN: In connection with the Bank Act which one sets the policy in the monetary field in the administration itself—the administration of the Act?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Of the Bank Act?

Mr. HAHN: The Bank of Canada in setting out the form and method of carrying on certain administrations. Are they set out through them or by the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This of course is the item which deals with the Inspector General of Banks and has nothing to do with the Bank of Canada or its operation.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I wonder if we could get Mr. Elderkin to innoculate a lot of other people. This expenditure seems to have been rather conservative.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think you will find that a very conservative approach applies throughout the whole of this department.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): The minister, would, I think agree that this is very special.

Item agreed to.

116. Administration of the Farm Improvement Loans Act and the Veterans' Business and Professional Loans Act, $74,178.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one question regarding departmental policy in this matter. My understanding of the administration of the Farm Improvements Loans Act is that it does not permit the applicant for a loan to have a rebuilding clause in his insurance policy, and that it is not acceptable to the board. I realize from the board's point of view why that would be so. In the event of fire and so on it would make it difficult for the board. The remarks I am going to make do not apply where there are farm mutual insurance companies in existence, but they will apply to parts of the country where there are not many farm mutual insurance companies in existence. In those places the cost of insurance on farm properties where there are no rebuilding clauses is nearly double and I was wondering if the minister would

care to make any comment on that because the people who obtain loans under this Act are people who are in the position of being least able to pay high insurance premiums. I believe the premium is nearly double when there is no rebuilding clause .

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Are you suggesting that our loaning is any different from the normal mortgage loaning on farms in that respect?

Mr. NESBITT: No, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is quite correct there but in as much as this is a governmental agency whose purpose—

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, no. We loan to the banks; the banks make the loans. Of which one you are speaking; the farm loan or the farm improvement loan?

Mr. NESBITT: My particular reference was to the farm loans board but I imagine the same policy would be under the farm improvement.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: As I say, if we were following any different practice under the Canadian Farm Loans Board than the ordinary mortgage loan, we would of course have to look at it, but I do not think you could expect us to be less secure in our loans with respect to insurance provisions than any other person.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not think it is actually a question of security but one of administration in the event of fire. These mortgages all, of course, have the normal terms. In the event of fire insurance is payable to the holder of the mortgage to the extent of the board's interest and I realize it might be a little difficult. A board might not wish to supervise or would have trouble supervising the construction of new buildings. I realize that quite well. It would be difficult from the board's point of view, but in view of the fact that the rates are so much higher when the building clause is not in the policy, I wondered if it might be taken into consideration because of the almost double premium and the fact that the people who have to obtain the loans are the people least able to pay them.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Will you give me an instance of what you have in mind that may have occurred and we will perhaps consider it.

Mr. NESBITT: I know of one instance—

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You can let me have the details and I will have a look at it.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Farm improvement loans were substantially reduced in 1954 as compared with 1953. Is that due in general to the worse situation of agriculture? One might have expected the number of loans would be up in 1954. I notice that it says widespread rust infectation accentuated the decline in the last half of the year.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Well, I cannot offer any ready explanation as to why there would be a decline unless it would be, as you say, that everyone might have acquired the extra plough he wanted or something along that line.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Perhaps the minister could offer an explanation when we meet again.

Mr. ARGUE: Does the minister not find that the banks are lending money much less readily under the Act than they have been? In other words, the banks themselves are making it more difficult for farmers to obtain loans under the Act.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I have had no complaint along that line, but I will look into it if you think it is so.

Mr. ARGUE: I know that it is so. There may be economic reasons for the banks taking that attitude, and rust may be an economic reason, but I think it is correct to say that the banks would almost meet you on the street and ask you to take a loan, and now it is much more difficult to obtain one.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: How fortunate it would be to live in the west!

Mr. ARGUE: How unfortunate in many instances to live in the west!

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, are there any offsetting revenues in item 116?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I do not think so.

Mr. REGIER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize what Mr. Nesbitt said. It seems to me from complaints I have heard that the business of an acceptable insurance policy is very much left to the discretion of the local government inspector and I think some encouragement ought to go out to the people that they should accept insurance policies at least similar to those that are acceptable to such reliable institutions as the Royal bank and so forth. I find they will accept insurance policies not acceptable to the Canadian Farm Loans Act.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I will have a look at it.

The CHAIRMAN: Item agreed to.

Tarriff Board—
117. Administration, $63,993.

Mr. THATCHER: I wonder if the minister would say in regard to the assay office, the degree to which it is self sufficient, or the degree to which there are revenues offsetting this expenditure?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We have revenue from the Mint; is that what you are referring to?

Mr. THATCHER: No, the assay office.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Well, we closed the Vancouver office on the first of April in the hope that we might save some money there.

Mr. THATCHER: Where do you do the work now?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: In Ottawa.

Mr. HELLYER: Was the Mint closed down for a while this year for retooling or something? Is the minister contemplating authorizing the minting of gold coins in the near future?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Hellyer!

Mr. ENFIELD: Are those serious questions, Mr. Hellyer?

Expenses of the Royal Canadian Mint, and the Assay office, Vancouver, B.C.—
118. Administration, Operation and Maintenance, $1,050,181.

Item agreed to.

119. Construction or Acquisition of New Equipment, $268,970.

Item agreed to.

120. Grants to Municipalities in lieu of taxes on Federal Property—To provide for payments to municipalities in accordance with the Municipal Grants Act, and the Rural Municipal Grants Regulations established by Order in Council of August 6, 1952, P.C. 3729; and to provide for payments to municipalities under Order in Council of July 19, 1950, P.C. 3456, in respect of the cost of medical and hospital services and supplies furnished to federal employees and other persons specified therein, $3,279,050.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item is on page 22 of the estimates. It is item 120, "Grants to municipalities, etcetera," and the details are on page 200.

Mr. HELLYER: In relation to the statutory items can we not have an explanation as to how the treasury is saving the taxpayers so much money by refunding and other mechanics?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You might get ideas if I elaborated on this.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Would the minister care to say something about the course of interest?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, except that it has been very satisfactory, thank you.

Mr. REGIER: Is the interest for the coming year less than for the past year, because of the lower rate—

An Hon. MEMBER: Good government!

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Because of the lower rate.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on the statutory items on page 21?

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we come to item 120, unless there are some questions on the statutory item on page 22 ahead of that.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I did not realize that the dominion-provincial agreements are under item 119. I would like to ask one question. There is to be a conference this autumn. Will it deal with these agreements? They do not expire until when?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They expire at the end of next year.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Will they be a subject of discussion?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): That is the chief purpose?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I notice there is reference to the province of Quebec here on page 21—

The CHAIRMAN: Would you please speak a little louder.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: On the subsidies and other payments to provinces.

The CHAIRMAN: Page 22?

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Page 21. Is there any agreement which has been reached yet?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is the subsidy that has always been paid. This is slightly more, of course than the original but there has been a subsidy paid to Quebec and certain other provinces since Confederation and this is a continuation of that.

The CHAIRMAN: The compensation to the provinces which Mr. Deschatelets made reference to is on page 22, providing for tax rental agreements. If there are no questions on the statutory items on 122, we will go to item 120, $3,279,000, details on page 200.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to ask the minister a few questions concerning item 120. First of all I would like to know how many municipalities are receiving these grants altogether?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Forty-eight up until the amendments were made during this session when we expected an increase up to about 100, I think.

Mr. THATCHER: Of this $3,279,000, how much will go to the city of Ottawa alone?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Of the present $3 million?

Mr. THATCHER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: $1,438,000.

Mr. THATCHER: And how much will the additional grant be under the new bill?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: About $1,100,000.

Mr. THATCHER: In other words, Ottawa will be receiving about $2½ million by way of these grants?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: I am a little concerned about the amounts which are going to Ottawa under this item. It seems to me that parliament is investing a very substantial amount of money in trying to build up a National Capital over the years. I also feel we have no assurance that the city of Ottawa, when it receives this money is going to use it for the purpose for which parliament expects it to be used. I would like to ask the minister if he feels that so far the cooperation which the Ottawa city council has given to the government in planning the National Capital has been satisfactory?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am qualified to speak as to that. Our municipal grants are made on the basis of qualification by the municipality within the terms of the Act, and when a municipality does qualify the issue of a cheque is then practically automatic. We are not in the position where we impose conditions or anythng like that upon the conduct of a municipal corporation.

Mr. MCWILLIAM: The municipality must provide some service to qualify, is that right?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. THATCHER: I do not want to embarrass the minister, but again I emphasize that over the next 10 years we may be spending $100 million or more—on this Federal District. If we are going to spend such a huge sum, and if we are going to get the kind of national capital we want, I do not think anybody will object. I may be an outsider, but I cannot say that the cooperation of the Ottawa city council in the past has been too good. For instance, the Federal District Commission adopted a national plan for Ottawa years ago and spent $200 thousand on it, yet the Ottawa civic authorities have not adopted it as their own. Moreover, when you drive along the roads and streets of Ottawa, they are not good enough for a national capital. I do not like the way Ottawa city is developing its sewage disposal system. It is not laid out properly. All I am saying is this: if parliament is going to spend huge sums of money on the city of Ottawa, it should have some kind of control over those expenditures.

I went back to the Senate debates the other day, and I found that we are the only capital in the world which spends all this money and then does not keep any control over it. I think the time has come for parliament to give pretty serious thought to a Federal District Commission, and I would like to ask the minister if it is the plan of the government to go into this problem in the near future.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We had intended, as you know, to combine the examination of the amendment to the Municipal Grants Act with a consideration of the activities of the Federal District Commission, but we were not able to do it. As it turned out, other things intervened; but it is the intention of the government to have a serious study made of the operation of the Federal District Commission, and in that way no doubt some of the questions raised as to the results being obtained for the money we are spending in and about Ottawa might probably come before parliament.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister be able to say whether it is the intention to have a commission or a parliamentary committee?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No decision has been made as to which would be the best way to undertake it in the particular circumstances. But there is a precedent in that there was an investigation by parliament of the Federal District Commission in 1942 and 1943, and we are inclined to follow precedents.

Mr. MONTEITH: As far as this particular amendment goes, there is no attempt to control it.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I made that clear that when the municipality qualified by conforming to the requirements of the statute, our job ended with the mailing of the cheque.

Mr. ARGUE: How much money is estimated to be paid to the municipalities on the change in the Act?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Slightly more than $6 million.

Mr. ARGUE: I am very pleased to see that increase. I think the idea of paying the municipalities in lieu of taxes is a good idea, over and above the amount they would otherwise obtain by way of taxes on federal property—that it is a good one, since the municipalities find it more difficult to finance than any other government in Canada.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: As I said the other day, when the provincial premiers were here, I was the only one who had a deficit last year. But I think you will find there are not too many municipalities which had a deficit.

Mr. ARGUE: You had a deficit, but it might perhaps have helped the municipalities if you had perhaps even a greater deficit.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Of course it would.

Mr. ARGUE: When a municipality should be helped is by and large at a time when the federal government develops an increased deficit, and vice versa. But that is a long story. I would like to see the government paying regular municipal taxes or something near to it, on its property. What would it cost the federal government to pay regular taxation on its property? In other words, removing the two per cent clause?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Macdonnell has said that it would cost $24 million.

Mr. ARGUE: $24 million. That amount should be sufficient.

Mr. REGIER: Has the federal government ever estimated how much it would cost the federal government?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No. You cannot estimate that at the moment. The mere fact of increasing grants by making provision for an additional percentage and removing certain requirements—you find that you have an additional, let us say, 50 municipalities, and an additional $3 million does not mean anything. You cannot scale it out to find the answer.

Mr. REGIER: Surely the Department of Public Works would know what is owned by the government of Canada in the various municipalities, through the assessment department.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I suppose they do, but it would take quite a long time to find out what we own in a given municipality where we have not yet had to look at the assessment rolls.

Mr. ARGUE: How many municipalities will receive the grant this year?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: About 100, after this amendment goes into operation.

Mr. ARGUE: In how many municipalities does the federal government own property?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I could put it on the record, but I think it is about 700.

Mr. ARGUE: You are paying one out of seven.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Item agreed to.

Mr. THATCHER: One further question on the city of Ottawa. The minister said that this year Parliament will spend $2½ million on this particular item. In all the city of Ottawa this year will be getting about $6 million. Is there any control whatever over the Ottawa city council once you write the cheque, to see that they use some of this money to build up a federal district?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is not connected with the Federal District Commission in any way. This is a payment in lieu of taxes under the Municipal Grants Act in much the same way as other grants are made under the Act; but it is not tied in in any sense with the Federal District Commission.

Mr. ARGUE: Let us suppose that Mayor Whitton decides to build a city hall where she wants it built, using parliament's money. Should we not have more control?

Mr. ENFIELD: Would it not be true to say that there is a measure of control in that the Federal District Commission have wide powers of expropriation. They can simply take over a piece of land by registering a document in the registry office signed by the proper signing officer. It is true that compensation has to be paid later, but surely the bargaining position is all on one side.

Mr. MONTEITH: It should be, as far as this particular amount of money goes.

Mr. THATCHER: I do not think so.

Mr. MONTEITH: This is purely paying taxes for the city's upkeep.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Perhaps we should put you on a committee next year if there is one appointed on the Federal District Commission.

Mr. THATCHER: Thank you. I shall remember that.

Item agreed to.

121. "Contingencies and Miscellaneous". To provide, subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, for miscellaneous minor and unforseen expenses including authority to re-use any sums repaid to this appropriation from other appropriations, and special compensation or other rewards for inventions or practical suggestions for improvements, $1,000,000.

Mr. MONTIETH: I would like to ask the minister about this appropriation for the year 1954-55 of $1,500,000. How much was spent?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: $1,435,346.

Mr. MONTEITH: And you estimate that you should receive this year a total item of $1 million.

The CHAIRMAN: Item agreed to.

122. Cost of Telephone Service at Ottawa for all Departments, $1,060,000.

The details are to be found on page 201.

Item agreed to.

123. Amount required to cover losses incurred on foreign exchange tendered in payment of accounts receivable, $1,000.

The details are to be found on page 201.

Mr. HAHN: Who determines the policy in respect to the Treasury Board or the Department of Finance allowing the dollar to find its own level?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I suppose the government takes the responsibility for it.

Mr. HAHN: Does the government set the policy?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: If the government were to decide to devaluate the dollar, it would require the assistance of both the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada in order to do it. But I take it that they would be responsible for the policy.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I have been asked several times who determines the value of our dollar which sometimes is worth so much, and the day after, so much. Who decides that? I know that the question of exports comes into the picture, but who determines it?

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Good government, good reputation.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think may be I should ask my deputy minister to give you an abbreviated lecture on this subject sometime, as to the operation of the free money market.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: I have been asked that question several times.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Would it not result from the number of people who want to buy, and who want to sell Canadian dollars day by day? One of those people is the Bank of Canada; and the Bank of Canada from time to time no doubt buys and sells, having in mind as to where the level of the Canadian dollar should be. Does that statement pass muster?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think that would be the beginning of the obvious.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I hope we will get the rest of it some day.

The CHAIRMAN: Item agreed to.

Mr. HAHN: You are saying that the Bank of Canada does not make any difference?

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): I think the Bank of Canada has a good deal to do with the level of the dollar; the bank, as we learned from Mr. Towers, is the instrument of the Department of Finance. Mr. Towers made that clear when he said that: "If he differed from the Department of Finance, his only course was to resign." That came to me as a little bit of a shock; but that is what he said. The Department of Finance decides these things and that is that.

The CHAIRMAN: I would have asked members to speak louder so as to make sure that this is on the record, except that it is not in order on this item, so if I asked Mr. Macdonnell to speak louder I would be asking him to be even more out of order.

Can we carry this item? We are on item 124 unless there is some question on preceding statutory items.

Mr. REGIER: Can we have an explanation of why there is the great reduction of $15 million in the government's contribution to superannuation; last year $39 million and this year $26 million.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is in regard to the reduction in the statutory item of $39,099,000 to $26 million.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The reason is that the $39 million last year was extraordinary. The figure of $26 million is a normal one. Last year we transferred into the account a lot of persons in respect of whom we had to pay.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Has it not been as high as $75 million during the last few years?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No. That was the contribution we made to the deficit. This is the actual annual cost.

Mr. REGIER: Will not something of that kind happen again this year when we are extending superannuation to cover a lot of additional employees this session?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I don't think so. I don't think so. I don't think an additional payment will be required.

Mr. REGIER: Will the minister say whether he thinks the fund now is actuarially sound?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think the minister will not make any comment.

Mr. REGIER: I notice that when you have a heavy budget and a surplus you put a big chunk in, and when you don't have a surplus you don't put it in. What is the reason for that? Is it high finance?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, it is just doing the very best job we can.

Mr. REGIER: With regard to this superannuation account, what is the present rate of retirement you calculate that on?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Four per cent.

Mr. REGIER: Isn't that very much higher than provincial superannuation accounts?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They vary, I am told between three per cent and five per cent.

Mr. THATCHER: One question with regard to the government's contribution to this fund: it seems to me that your predecessor, Mr. Minister, said the government would pay so much in each year until it was actuarially sound.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I will try to carry that out next year.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): Seriously, though, there must be a figure showing how much there is to be made up. Certainly a substantial amount remains to be contributed.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I am told the amount is $189 million.

Mr. THATCHER: There is a government deficit of that amount?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

124. To provide, subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, for supplementing other votes for the payment of salaries, wages and other paylist charges, $750,000.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on item 124, details on page 204.

Mr. MONTEITH: How much of the $1,500,000 was required last year?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: $1,294,365.

Mr. HELLYER: What are some examples of the type of thing this is used for?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: These are additions by way of increased wages. The largest figure is half a million dollars to the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The next largest is Justice and Penitentiaries, $215,000.

Item agreed to.

125. To provide for the Government's contribution, as an Employer, to the Unemployment Insurance Fund in respect of Government Employees paid through the Central Pay Office, $1,080,000.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on the statutory items on page 23?

Mr. REGIER: On that list, with regard to payment of gratuities to families of deceased employees I see there is a reduction from $300,000 to $45,000. Does that mean that this year payments of wages ends on the day of the death of the civil servant?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: If you will look at the two items you will find that this is merely a re-definition, and they total $280,000.

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

126. To provide grants to institutions of higher learning recognized in each province by the Government of Canada and the government of the province as being universities or institutions of equivalent standing equal to an amount, for each province, not exceeding 50 cents per head of its population as certified by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics divided among the recognized institutions of the province proportionately to their enrolment of full time intramural students in personal attendance at the recognized institution or at an institution in the same province affiliated with it who are registered in courses of university level recognized as leading to and counting year for year toward a university degree awarded by a university in Canada and the Minister of Finance may for this purpose more particularly define the terms "university level" and "university degree", $7,800,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL: A point arises here which I should very much like to raise as I think it is a very important one. The point is this: the grant at present is made on the basis of 50 cents per head of the population. It has

come to my attention that in the province of Nova Scotia the percentage of students to population is higher than it is in Ontario. I do not know whether that means that they are more intelligent than we are or less intelligent. But the difference is quite substantial and it bears very hard on them. I was wondering, if this turns out to be the general situation, whether the present procedure could be altered, and if the minister would look into the matter. Has he received any representations regarding it?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I have not received any representations personally but I am informed that they have come to the department and I am of course aware of the situation which Mr. Macdonnell refers to. The situation is rather notorious, as a matter of fact, in the province of Nova Scotia as he suggested.

Mr. MACDONNELL *(Greenwood)*: It would seem to me to be a situation where there is a pretty strong argument for basing this grant on education rather than on population. I would find it awfully difficult as a resident of Ontario to argue against that. I hope nobody will tell any of my co-trustees at Queens University that I am arguing this, but nevertheless I do argue it because it seems to me to be fair.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: These representations have been made, and I will be glad to look at them.

Mr. NESBITT: Could the minister tell us what universities receive these grants? Has he got a list available?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I have quite a list giving the universities and the amounts—it would take rather a long time to read.

Mr. NESBITT: If the minister will file it, that will be sufficient.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: What exactly was your question?

Mr. NESBITT: I asked what universities actually did receive grants, and the amounts which they received.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You will find that set out in the public accounts. I prefer not to read the complete list, though I could give you the information by reading it.

Mr. MACDONNELL *(Greenwood)*: Would you consider whether there is anything which this committee should do with regard to this matter? Is there no recommendation which we could make which might lead to action?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. This is a highly technical problem of who is a student in all the provinces and who is not. We would have to go into a lot of detail before we could come to any intelligent conclusion on which to base a recommendation.

Mr. REGIER: Mr. Chairman, we have a considerable shortage of candidates for certain skilled professions. Has the minister ever been approached with a request for an additional grant to encourage, for example, teacher training, to encourage more Canadian students to enter the medical field and so on? Has any consideration ever been given to adding to the amounts now being allotted to the universities additional sums of money to be expended on specific lines in the national interest so that these urgent national needs would be satisfied?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Every session, as you know, we have an argument about contributions to the cause of education and I am quite sure that every university would welcome a grant of a specific nature such as you have mentioned, but one considers all these things as they are presented, and up to the present time there has been no inclination to go further than the grants to the universities now being made.

Mr. REGIER: The thing I have in mind is that right now we pay as much per annum for an art student who may take up any occupation once he graduates as for a medical student or the highly skilled people I have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I don't think you would expect me to assess the relative value of the graduate in arts who goes into business or into government service and a medical doctor.

Mr. ENFIELD: What is the basis for these grants? Is it a bill or a resolution?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This is the basis—this vote.

Mr. ENFIELD: So the policy which decides the amount to be spent is created by the Department of Finance?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The Department of Finance votes the $7 million or whatever it may be, and distribution is by a complicated formula which was worked out by the universities, the provincial governments and the federal government.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we have a list of the payments so that we might have it in the record?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It will be found at page F-17 of volume 1 of 1954, and on the following page.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that that will go into our proceedings as an appendix?

Agreed. (*See Appendix "J"*)

127. Canadian Association of Consumers, $10,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried?

Item agreed to.

539. Loan to the Ottawa Civil Service Recreational Association, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, to assist in the construction of the W. Clifford Clark Memorial Recreation Centre, $500,000.

Mr. HAHN: What rate of interest is to be charged on that loan?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The rate of interest is to be set by the Governor in Council.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister explain the purpose of this?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Two or three years ago the Civil Service Commission decided to honour the late Dr. Clark and for that purpose they took up a collection of quite substantial sums of money among members of the Civil Service for the purpose of building a recreational centre for the civil service. At that time the government promised assistance if the project were carried out by the civil servants themselves. We are now at the point where they have completed the collections they expect to make and they have asked us to assist them, and the assistance takes the form of a loan for the purpose of building a recreational centre.

Mr. THATCHER: When will this be paid back and in what manner?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We have not fixed the term. We hope to get it back over a period of years.

Mr. THATCHER: This is not a gift—it is definitely a loan?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Oh, it will be a loan—

Mr. THATCHER: I want to get this definitely from the minister. Is it or is it not a loan?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This is a loan.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: For the next item we must turn to the supplementary estimates on page 3.

Mr. MONTEITH: May I ask a question which arises on page 197. I note that the revenue is estimated to be $130 million in respect of return on investments for all departments. Does that mean investments in other departments, or in all departments in the Department of Finance?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The Department of Finance handles all the investments of the government and this represents the total revenue of all departments.

Mr. MONTEITH: Except for separate boards?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Oh, yes.

653. Grants to Municipalities in lieu of taxes on Federal Property—To provide for payments to municipalities in accordance with the Municipal Grants Act, and the Rural Municipal Grants Regulations as made and established by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1621, dated October 28, 1954, and to provide for payments to municipalities under Order in Council P.C. 1954-1497, dated October 6, 1954, in respect of the cost of medical and hospital services and supplies furnished to federal employees and other persons specified therein—Further amount required including authority to regard the Admiralty Properties in the city of St. John's, Newfoundland, as Federal Property notwithstanding that formal transfer of administration has not been completed, $3,177,200.

Mr. HAHN: Does this represent the additional grant?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This is the additional grant consequent upon our amendment.

Mr. HAHN: Could we have a list of the municipalities which will now be included?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I don't think we could do that because these grants are paid on the application of the municipalities and we could not say how many would apply or how many would qualify.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this item carried?

Item agreed to.

654. To provide for expenses of a Royal Commission on economic prospects, including the payment, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, of honoraria or allowances as may be authorized by the Treasury Board to officers, clerks or employees permanently employed in the Civil Service for services rendered by them to the commission, $300,000.

Mr. REGIER: On this item, could the minister tell us what was the cost to the government of the Rowell-Sirois Royal Commission?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Half a million dollars.

Mr. MACDONNELL (*Greenwood*): It went on over how many years?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It ran into the third year.

Item agreed to.

655. To provide for a contribution to the Government of the Province of Ontario for assistance in meeting costs resulting from floods, arising out of Hurricane Hazel, on October 15th and 16th, 1954 (Revote), $669,742.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This was passed as a supplementary item in the spring. This is a re-vote.

Mr. ARGUE: What is the total amount paid by the federal government as a result of Hurricane Hazel?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The total amount at the moment is about $231,000 but we expect it will run to about $1 million. We are paying 50 per cent with the province, with a maximum of $5,000 and deductible of $200.

Mr. ARGUE: Per individual?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: If I might make a comment on this item, the general proposition of paying damages in situations such as this, I am hoping that the minister will give very sympathetic consideration to the application of the Province

of Saskatchewan and the application of the Province of Manitoba for payments as a result of spring flood damage. You can read in the press, which is perfectly true, that crop conditions are relatively good and that the general flood picture is not there any more. That is true. But I would like the minister to keep one or two things in mind, if he will, and that is this, that a percentage of farmers have suffered greatly. The Prime Minister has said no payment can be made as a result of loss of crop, but if a payment is made only on the basis of physical damage to land I believe that a very substantial payment would need to be made. I would like to point out to the minister that the land that has been flooded two or three years in a row has suffered physical deterioration and the agricultural faculty of the University of Manitoba are going so far now as to recommend to farmers in Manitoba that they endeavour to seed now land that has not had a crop on it for two or three years, and that they seed it now in July by aeroplane if necessary in order to get a green crop on it to restore its structure.

It is my opinion that the municipalities in my own province have lost by way of floods within our municipality the equivalent of two years budget for roads. I think in the average municipality by the end of this year they will not have repaired the damage to their roads caused by spring floods. Even though the crop situation is very much better than we might have hoped, nevertheless, there is still a good deal of damage which has resulted from that flood.

Item agreed to.

656. To provide for a Grant to the Canadian Olympic Association to help defray expenses of the Canadian team for the 1956 Olympic games, $60,000.

Mr. HAHN: On this item, was the minister approached with respect to assistance for the British Empire Games Fund in Vancouver?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, we made a contribution to that last year of $200,000.

Mr. ENFIELD: Does this grant compare with previous grants for Olympic games?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We made a grant of $40,000 the last time.

Mr. ENFIELD: This is one third more than the last.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Half as much again.

Mr. HAHN: Is the purpose of that fund more particularly for competition or what is its purpose?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: They estimated their total cost and we made a contribution based on that. How they use it in paying their bills is up to them.

Item agreed to.

789. To authorize the purchase of 3,600 shares of stock of the International Finance Corporation being Canada's subscription as a member thereof for the amount of $3,600,000 U.S., notwithstanding that payment may exceed or fall short of the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of May, 1955, $3,555,000.

Mr. THATCHER: Is this a usual expenditure?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is the first time it has appeared. The bank is not yet in existence but is expected to be by agreement of the various countries during the course of the fiscal year and we will buy our share of the stock in it.

Item agreed to.

795. To provide, subject to terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council, for payment of assistance to producers of salted cod, haddock, pollock, hake and cusk, in the amount of 50 per cent of the laid down cost of salt used in their 1955 production; including authority to charge administrative costs to Vote 153 of the Main Estimates, 1955-56, $500,000.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like an explanation of 795.

The CHAIRMAN: That is fisheries.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is an error I made in including that item in these departmental estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we now come back to item 112.

Mr. MONTEITH: I would like to ask the minister are there any revolving funds in his department?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: The Mint has a revolving fund for the purpose of coinage and the amount used last year will be shown in the public accounts, volume 1, page F-22.

Mr. MONTEITH: Would you mind reading that·

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Gold Purchase Account $3,406,319. Silver coinage account $3,094,000, Silver bullion purchase account $158,000, Nickel coinage account $10,374, Bronze Coinage Account $448,000. Steel coinage account $127,000.

Mr. MONTEITH: Has that been refunded?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It is a revolving fund.

Mr. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it would be possible for the minister or for someone in his department to supply the committee with a list of all subsidies and subventions which are going to be paid by the government this year in all departments? I know I could obtain them by going through the estimates carefully myself. However some are hidden and in order to get a complete list of all of them, I would like to see the department prepare such figures and either put them on the minutes or let me have them. I think a lot of the members might be shocked if they saw the sum total of these subsidies adds up to.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: In the summary of standard objects of expenditures there is a heading "contributions, grants, subsidies, etc., not included elsewhere." They total about $326 million. Now of course this table does not explain the nature of the subsidy.

Mr. THATCHER: I would like to get a list including items such as those: we pay out so much for the gold subsidy, so much for the feed grain subsidy, so much for the coal subsidy, etc.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You have not in mind contributions to the olympic games or the Red Cross or things of that nature.

Mr. THATCHER: No.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You mean a subsidy and you would not worry about the tariff being a subsidy.

Mr. THATCHER: No.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: You mean a direct subsidy made by the Government of Canada?

Mr. THATCHER: I would include the universities.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We could give you a list but I am afraid you would be able to come along afterwards and say: there you have a subsidy in that particular thing and you have not it in your list.

Mr. THATCHER: I would appreciate it if you would give me a list.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We will try to give you a list.

Mr. MONTEITH: Is that going to be in the record? If not, I would like a copy of it also.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I think perhaps not. I should not say anything about the session being at an end, but it would take some time to work this out and

I would prefer it if we could give it as an order for a return in the House or provide it to members who want it.

The CHAIRMAN: Anyone who asked for it can be furnished with it when it is made up.

Now we are on departmental administration, item 112.

Mr. ARGUE: If we are on the general item, I wonder if the minister could give the committee some idea of what losses of revenue may be involved in the various depletion allowances that are allowed. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the subject to know what those all are but there are generous allowances to mining companies; the first three and half years of operations they do not pay any taxes. How much is involved in these various categories?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: It would be very difficult to do that. It would require an examination of the tax returns and we do not do that.

Mr. ARGUE: Do you not have some general estimate of what may be involved. I do not mean in detail. Am I not right that a mining company in the first three and a half years of operation pays no corporation taxes? Suppose it paid the standard corporation tax, what would be the approximate amount of revenue?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: If the mining venture had no income they would not report an income in that year which would be taxable in that period of time and we would have to make an estimate. The two things you have in mind are depletion and the exemption from income tax for the period of time in the formative state?

Mr. ARGUE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: We will see what we can do with it.

Mr. ARGUE: You told us this morning, Mr. Minister, that the general attitude of the Department of Finance to the various estimates of other departments was that they should be kept as small as possible. I thought in the cyclical theory of budgeting at a time when there were unemployed resources in the country that it was the attitude of the government that expenditures might be encouraged at that time. I am wondering if the general attitude has been expenditures should always be kept down and that must mean that the cyclical theory of budgeting has been forgotten.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Just what position are we in now? Perhaps I should make a very brief statement on this matter. I am convinced that a good many of the honourable members in the House of Commons who urged me to cut taxes for the purpose of stimulating business as little as three months ago would not do so at the moment.

Mr. ARGUE: This is what I understand you to say and you can tell me if I am right or wrong: a theory may be a good theory and it may be a theory the government might wish to follow, but you and your officials did not believe economic conditions at the time you were going through the estimates were such as to warrant that kind of policy at that time?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Well, perhaps I had better not say this, but the budget was devised at a time when we had in mind the slight decline in business that occurred in 1954. I do not think we took the view that the decline was going to continue, and I think I said so in the budget speech. On the other hand, we had to take into account the fact that there was a decline, but to attribute to the budget policy any set rule that we were following a policy such as you described would be incorrect, because the budget is a combination of many factors. It is not an orthodox doctrine which says you must do so and so under such conditions. You must decide every year what you will do. But to answer your main question, I think you must bear in mind that if you

happen to believe in a policy of spending money at a time in order to promote spending and business, you would be in a better position to do that if in the meantime you were more careful about saving money. It is always good business to save money, and I cannot imagine any condition when it is not.

Mr. ARGUE: I think that depends on how you want to save the money. I think the country is making a mistake by saving the amount that might be necessary by adding another $10 to the old age pension. You can save money in certain areas of the country to the detriment of the whole Canadian nation, I think. This may be out of order and I should have raised it before, but I wonder if the minister could say when a decision might be reached as to what payments will be made on account of flood damage in the west?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: No, I could not. The prime minister has stated on more than one occasion that the government is considering the representations which have been made and I would not want to go further than that.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 795 was referred to us.

795. To provide, subject to terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council, for payment of assistance to producers of salted cod, haddock, pollock, hake and cusk, in the amount of 50 per cent of the laid down cost of salt used in their 1955 production; including authority to charge administrative costs to Vote 153 of the Main Estimates, 1955-56, $500,000.

If I have your approval, we will report this item back with appropriate language.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: Yes, that was an error of mine in incorporating it in the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The fifth report then, gentlemen, would be as follows: your committee has considered and approved items 112 to 127 inclusive and item 539 in the main estimates for 1955-56 and items 653 to 656 inclusive and item 789 in the supplementary estimates for 1955-56 relating to the Department of Finance.

That is the same form of report made in regard to the other departments. Then there would be an item reporting back to the committee item 795 also referred to it by the House. It will be just reported back.

Mr. CANNON: Why is it reported back?

The CHAIRMAN: Because when it is referred to us it seems to me that until it is reported back the House cannot take it into consideration. I think we have to take it into consideration and report it.

Mr. ENFIELD: Let us carry it.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, why not carry it?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: This has not been carried in the House and there is no reason why we cannot carry it with a recommendation.

Mr. HELLYER: It will simplify your report, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Have I your authority to say that we have also considered and approved it?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. THATCHER: That is fine with me. Am I to assume that our committee has finished its annual work?

The CHAIRMAN: We never make a final report of the committee on estimates because we never know when another department will be referred to us.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister make a statement in that regard?

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I am sure everyone will want to do all the work he can before he goes home.

The CHAIRMAN: Have I a motion to approve this report including the further item which I mentioned, number 795?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is made by Mr. Hellyer and seconded by Mr. Hahn. Is that carried?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like on your behalf to thank the minister and his officials for the able assistance they have given us. There will, of course, be no meeting tonight.

The committee adjourned.

APPENDIX "J"

(Extract from the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1954.)

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

Grants under authority of a vote by Parliament and the University Grants Regulations established by P.C. 123, January 9, 1952, as amended by P.C. 1061, February 22, 1952, were paid as follows:

Newfoundland	
St. John's	
Memorial University College	191,500
Nova Scotia	
Antigonish	
St. Francis Xavier University	81,449
Church Point	
College Sainte-Anne	5,734
Halifax	
Dalhousie University	111,052
University of King's College	7,723
Holy Heart Seminary	9,514
Maritime School of Social Work	1,690
Mount Saint Vincent College	19,989
Nova Scotia Technical College	17,768
Pine Hill Divinity Hall	3,149
Sacred Heart Convent	1,425
St. Mary's University	20,884
Truro	
Nova Scotia Agricultural College	5,005
Wolfville	
Acadia University	46,111
	331,500
Prince Edward Island	
Charlottetown	
Prince of Wales College	20,532
St. Dunstan's College	32,467
New Brunswick	
Bathurst West	
College du Sacre-Coeur	11,979
Chatham	
St. Thomas College	9,567
Edmundston	
College St. Louis	20,368
Fredericton	
University of New Brunswick	99,133
Sackville	
Mount Allison University	95,676
St. Joseph	
University of St. Joseph	31,275
	268,000
Ontario	
Cornwall	
College Classique de Cornwall	489
Guelph	
Ontario Agricultural College	75,168
Ontario Veterinary College	46,031
Hamilton	
McMaster University	130,505
Kingston	
Queen's Theological College	3,672
Queen's University	310,714
Kitchener	
St. Jerome's College	1,713
London	
Huron College	6,366
Music Teachers' College	3,427
St. Peter's College	5,876
University of Western Ontario	277,415
Ursuline College of Arts	11,752
Ottawa	
Carleton College	54,111
College Bruyere	3,427
Notre-Dame College	5,631
Petit Seminaire d'Ottawa	7,345
St. Patrick's College	18,118
Universite d'Ottawa	167,477
Sudbury	
College du Sacre-Coeur	9,794
Toronto	
Knox College	6,366
St. Michael's College	84,473
Trinity College	68,068
University of Toronto	920,680
Victoria College	152,786
Wycliffe College	3,427
Waterloo	
Waterloo College	24,485
Windsor	
Assumption College	48,970
	2,448,500
Manitoba	
Brandon	
Brandon College	19,051
St. Boniface	
St. Boniface College	8,090
Winnipeg	
Manitoba Law School	15,694
St. John's College	4,489
St. Paul's College	9,586
United College	55,618
University of Manitoba	291,968
	404,500
Saskatchewan	
Gravelbourg	
College Catholique de Gravelbourg	6,199
Lebret	
Scolasticat du Sacre-Coeur	3,357

Muenster	
St. Peter's College	731
North Battleford	
St. Thomas College	2,841
Regina	
Campion College	3,185
Luther College	3,013
St. Chad's College	1,248
Saskatoon	
Emmanuel College	4,261
Lutheran College and Seminary	1,765
Luther Theological Seminary	3,013
St. Andrew's College	3,573
St. Thomas More College	28,068
University of Saskatchewan	363,901
Wilcox	
Notre-Dame College	5,338
	430,500

Alberta

Edmonton	
College Saint Jean	2,354
St. Joseph's College	1,753
St. Stephen's College	2,705
University of Alberta	494,186
	501,000

British Columbia

Nelson	
Notre-Dame College	6,703
Vancouver	
Anglican Theological College	3,075
Union College of British Columbia	2,152
University of British Columbia	571,950
Victoria	
Victoria College	31,119
	615,000
	$ 5,243,500

Bound by
Harpell's Press Co-operative
Gardenvale