

No. 52

*Pg 9
Hardie
Massey Grant*

HOUSE OF COMMONS
OTTAWA, CANADA

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS
AND
ORDERS OF THE DAY

MONDAY, MARCH 21

1955

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.
Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

1955

February 11—*The Minister of Veterans Affairs*—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Veterans Benefit Act, 1954".

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS

1955

March 18—Bill No. 263 (Letter F of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to implement the Convention on Damage caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the Surface".—*The Minister of Transport*.

ORDER OF PRECEDENCE:—Questions; Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers; Government Notices of Motions; Government Orders; Private Bills; Senate Amendments to Public Bills; Notices of Motions; Public Bills and Orders.

QUESTIONS

(Questions to be answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

1955

No. 1—*Mr. Knowles*

January 26—1. Has Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited made application to the Federal Government for a guarantee of its bonds in connection with the financing of the said company's gas pipe line?

2. If so, what is the dollar value of the bonds for which such guarantee is sought?

3. Has the said company asked that such guarantee cover (a) principal; (b) interest?

4. If such an application has been made to the Government, has the Government considered it?

5. If so, what is the result of such consideration?

6. If Government underwriting of the project is being regarded as necessary, is the Government giving consideration to the desirability of the proposed all-Canadian pipeline being Government owned?

No. 2—*Mr. Knowles*

January 27—1. What proportion of the capital necessary to build its all-Canadian gas pipeline does Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited propose to raise (a) by the sale of shares of common stock; (b) by the sale of shares of preferred stock; (c) by the sale of bonds?

2. Is Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited now contending that it cannot build its gas pipeline without a government guarantee of its bonds?

3. If so, what other ways of building such an all-Canadian gas pipeline are being considered by the Government?

No. 3—*Mr. Bryson*

February 21—1. How many bushels of wheat were shipped through the Port of Churchill, in each year since January 1, 1944?

2. What grades of wheat were shipped from this port in 1954, and how many bushels of each grade?

3. What grades of wheat are presently stored at Churchill, and how many bushels of each grade?

4. What has been the selling price of Number 2 Northern Wheat, in each year since January 1, 1944, at Churchill?

5. What has been the selling price of Number 2 Northern Wheat, in each year since January 1, 1944, at Fort William and at Montreal?

6. What are the shipping costs per bushel of wheat from Churchill to Liverpool and from Montreal to Liverpool?

7. What are the Hull insurance rates on cargoes of grain to the United Kingdom from Churchill and from Montreal?

No. 4—*Mr. Hamilton* (York West)

February 23—1. What number of air crew are required to be recruited annually for the Royal Canadian Air Force to maintain the air strength necessary for present policy and commitments?

2. What were the actual enlistments for air crew during the last twelve months for which information is available?

3. (a) How many applications for enlistment as air crew were received during the last twelve months for which information is available?

(b) How many of these were rejected and for what reasons under the following headings: (i) physical disability; (ii) failure to meet educational requirements; (iii) other reasons?

4. How many air crew passed their courses and qualified during the last twelve months for which information is available?

5. How many qualified air crew were discharged from the service during the last twelve months for which information is available and for what reasons: (a) physical disability; (b) completion of term of service; (c) other reasons?

No. 5—*Mr. Stewart* (Winnipeg North)

February 24—1. How many Royal Canadian Air Force trainers have crashed since January 1, 1954?

2. How many of these were T 33 jets?

3. How many deaths have occurred as a result of such crashes?

4. How many of these (a) T 33 crashes; (b) other trainer crashes, were caused by (i) weather conditions; (ii) aircraft failures; (iii) human error?

5. How many crashes in each category occurred in each training station?

No. 6—*Mr. Balcom*

March 7—1. (A) In the Atlantic Region (including Newfoundland), (i) at the end of 1950; (ii) at the end of 1954, what were the number of (a) steam locomotives in service; (b) road steam engines according to class and/or tractive power; (c) switchers?

(B) In the Atlantic Region (excluding Newfoundland), (i) at the end of 1950; (ii) at the end of 1954, how many (a) steam locomotives; (b) road steam engines; (c) switchers, were on loan or lease from other regions, including Grand Trunk Western?

2. In the Atlantic Region (including Newfoundland) at the end of (i) 1950; (ii) 1954, what were the number of (a) diesels directly allocated to this region; (b) road units according to class and/or tractive power; (c) switchers?

3. (A) In the Atlantic Region (excluding Newfoundland), for, (i) 1950; (ii) 1954, what number of steam locomotives were shipped for No. 3 general repairs at (a) Moncton shops; (b) elsewhere?

(B) In the Atlantic Region (including Newfoundland), what number of steam locomotives were retired from service in (i) 1950; (ii) 1954?

4. What were the total number of locomotives available for service in the Atlantic Region (including Newfoundland), in (i) 1950; (ii) 1954, (a) steam; (b) diesel?

5. How many additional diesel units are planned for the Atlantic Region (including Newfoundland) in 1955, (a) road units; (b) switchers?

6. How many steam locomotives are scheduled to be retired in 1955?

No. 7—*Mr. Buchanan*

March 9—1. What money grants, if any, were paid to the following hospitals in Cape Breton, for the last four years: (a) Harbour View Hospital, Sydney Mines; (b) St. Elizabeth, North Sydney; (c) Cape Breton Hospital; (d) Pt. Edward T. B. Hospital?

2. In addition to money grants, what equipment was supplied to the above hospitals by the Federal Government, during the same period?

No. 8—*Mr. Cardiff*

March 9—1. Under Order-in-Council P.C. 1954-673 and Public Service Superannuation Regulations thereunder, how many civil servants have been retired?

2. What were the respective positions held by each of such civil servants?

3. What were the years of service and the age at retirement of each of them?

4. In what branch of government did each of them serve?

No. 9—*Mr. Pommer*

March 9—How many civil servants, permanent and temporary, were employed in each of the Federal Government Departments, during each of the years from 1945 to 1954 inclusive?

No. 10—*Mr. Zaplitny*

March 10—1. Has the Department of Defence Production made loans, advances or investments with respect to the following corporations, from April 1, 1945 to March 31, 1954: (a) Canadian Pratt & Whitney, Aircraft Company Ltd., Longueuil, Quebec; (b) John Inglis Company Ltd., Toronto, Ontario; (c) Light Alloys Ltd., Toronto, Ontario; (d) A. V. Roe Canada Ltd., Malton, Ontario; (e) Sorel Industries Ltd., Sorel, Quebec?

2. If so, what was the total amount of loans, advances or investments in each case for the said period?

3. What amounts have been repaid by the said corporations as at March 31, 1954?

4. What interest, if any, has the Canadian Government received, in each case, from the said corporations on these loans, advances or investments?

No. 11—*Mr. Zaplitny*

March 10—1. During the fiscal year 1953-54 did the Department of Defence Production purchase cloth from the following companies: (a) Verney Corporation of Canada Ltd., Montreal; (b) Montreal Cottons Ltd., Valleyfield, Quebec?

2. If so, what was the quantity and grade of cloth so purchased in each case?
3. What was the total amount paid to each of the companies, noted above, for such cloth?
4. What was the per unit price paid to each company?

No. 12—*Mr. Bell*

March 10—1. Has the Federal Government requested in any manner an expression of intention from the provinces regarding participation by them in the development of atomic energy for power?

2. If so, when and in what manner?
3. Have any provinces replied to same or made other representation to the Federal Government in connection with this said development of atomic energy for power?
4. If so, which provinces, and when?
5. What is the present basis for such negotiations?
6. Are both privately-owned power companies and the provincial power commissions being considered?
7. Have offers to participate been received by the Federal Government from any private companies?
8. If so, by whom and when?
9. What decisions have been taken to date?

No. 13—*Mr. Purdy*

March 10—1. When did the Physical Fitness Act come into force?

2. When did operations under this Act cease?
3. What amount would have been available to each of the provinces, during each of the years of the operation of this Act had they taken full advantage of same?
4. What amount was paid to each province each year during the operation of the Act?

No. 14—*Mr. Hodgson*

March 10—How many maintenance of way employees of the Canadian National Railways will be laid off on account of the recent change in section crews?

No. 15—*Mr. Hardie*

March 10—1. What was the total amount paid to residents of the Northwest Territories by the Department of National Health and Welfare in each of the years 1952, 1953 and 1954, for (a) old age security pensions; (b) old age assistance allowances?

2. What was the total amount paid to residents of the Northwest Territories by the Department of National Health and Welfare for family allowances, in each of the years 1946 to 1954 inclusive?

No. 16—*Mr. Diefenbaker*

March 10—1. Has the abbreviation and designation of "O.H.M.S." been discontinued on letters despatched by any of the departments of the government and the designation "G" substituted in lieu thereof?

2. If so, for what reason was the change made?
3. Who authorized the change and what was the date of such authorization?

No. 17—*Mr. Dufresne*

March 10—1. Has the Canadian National Railways decided to close the railways stations at St. Stanislas and St. Adelphe, in the County of Champlain, St. Elizabeth, in the County of Joliette, St. Perpetue, in the County of Kamouraska, St. Joseph-du-lac, in the County of Nicolet, and Villemontel, in the County of Abitibi?

2. Has the Canadian National Railways decided to cancel the day train between Quebec City and Garneau, via St. Prosper?

3. If so, will steps be taken to protect the travelling public of the said localities?

No. 18—*Mr. Knowles*

March 11—1. In each of the last three years for which records are available, how many income taxpayers required by law to make quarterly payments during the year had failed to do so?

2. What steps does the government take to inform such taxpayers that such quarterly payments have to be made?

No. 19—*Mr. Stanton*

March 11—1. How many vice-presidents are in the Canadian National Railways, (a) as of this date; (b) on the 1st of January, in each of the years 1945 to 1954 inclusive?

2. What is the name, and date of appointment of each of the present incumbents?
3. What are the total salaries of the combined vice-presidents?

No. 20—*Mr. Diefenbaker*

March 14—1. Has the Government given any assistance by way of grant or contribution to any province or municipality for the construction of bridges not located on the Trans-Canada Highway, since January, 1949?

2. If so, in what cases, and what was the amount of the grant or contribution in each case?

No. 21—*Mr. Knowles*

March 14—1. How are the monthly unemployment figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics obtained?

2. How many persons are engaged as canvassers in connection with any surveying or sampling done for the purpose of obtaining such figures?
3. What are the qualifications of the persons doing any such canvassing?
4. In what ways is such canvassing done?
5. How many persons are canvassed or surveyed each month in connection with the obtaining of such Dominion Bureau of Statistics unemployment figures?

No. 22—*Mr. Dinsdale*

March 14—1. Was the Canadian Government consulted concerning the possible extension of an invitation to the Prime Minister of the Gold Coast to attend the recent Commonwealth Conference in London?

2. If so, did the Canadian Government express an opinion on the question, and, if so, what was the opinion?

3. Has the Canadian Government been consulted concerning the admission of the Gold Coast to full membership in the Commonwealth?

4. If so, has the Canadian Government expressed an opinion on the question, and, if so, what was the opinion?

5. Can states be admitted to full membership of the Commonwealth without the approval of the Canadian Government?

No. 23—*Mr. Dinsdale*

March 14—1. Did the Prime Minister of the Central African Federation attend the recent Commonwealth Conference in London?

2. Did he participate as a full member of the Conference?

3. Was the Canadian Government consulted concerning the invitation extended to the Prime Minister of the Central African Federation? If so, when, and did the Canadian Government approve this invitation?

4. Has the Canadian Government been consulted concerning the admission of the Central African Federation to full membership in the Commonwealth?

5. If so, has the Canadian Government approved the admission of the Central African Federation to full membership in the Commonwealth, and, if so, when?

6. Is the Central African Federation a full member of the Commonwealth? If so, when did it become a full member?

No. 24—*Mr. Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough)*

March 15—1. Has the Federal Government, through the Department of Trade and Commerce or any of its Departments, Crown Companies or Agencies, studied the possibilities of assisting the textile industry by using radioactive substances?

2. If so, with what results to date?

3. Have any of the above Departments, Crown Companies or Government Agencies experimented with textiles by treating same with silicones to tighten the weave and make cotton and wool durable?

No. 25—*Mr. Balcom*

March 15—How many tons of Nova Scotia coal have been purchased for use of government buildings in Ontario during: (a) 1952; (b) 1953; (c) 1954?

No. 26—*Mr. Balcom*

March 15—1. What amount of (a) raw sugar; (b) refined sugar, was imported into Canada from the Dominican Republic, during the years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

2. In each case, what was the Canadian port of entry?

3. What amount of raw sugar was imported into Canada from Cuba, during years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

4. In each case, what was the Canadian port of entry?

No. 27—*Mr. Tustin*

March 15—What were the total imports into Canada for the year 1954, showing country of origin, volume and value of (a) canned peaches; (b) canned pears; (c) canned fruit salad; (d) other canned fruits?

No. 28—*Mr. Castleden*

March 15—1. Which (a) terminal elevators; (b) eastern elevators, were weighed-over during the 1952-53 crop year?

2. What was the date of weigh-over in each case?

3. Who was the representative on the Board of Grain Commissioners at each of these weigh-overs?

4. In which of these elevators was weigh-over deferred beyond the 22 month period?

5. During what period of time since 1950 has the position of Assistant Commissioner been vacant?

No. 29—*Mr. Brooks*

March 15—1. What was the amount (a) in tons; (b) in value of goods manufactured or produced in Canada exported through Canadian seaports and United States seaports, respectively, for each month from January 1, 1954 to February 1, 1955?

2. What was the amount (a) in tons; (b) in value of goods imported for use in Canada through Canadian and United States seaports, respectively, for each month from January 1, 1954 to February 1, 1955?

No. 30—*Mr. Kickham*

March 16—What federal grants have been made to each of the hospitals in the Province of Prince Edward Island?

No. 31—*Mr. Fraser (Peterborough)*

March 17—What was the total amount of money received in fines from the four thousand or more (a) individuals; (b) corporations, who were convicted of infractions of the Income Tax Act in 1954?

No. 32—*Mr. Hardie*

March 17—Under the Massey Grant Recommendations, what payment was made per university student for each province in (a) 1953-54; (b) 1954-55 to date?

No. 33—*Mr. Patterson*

March 18—1. How many tenders were submitted for the garbage hauling contract at Camp Chilliwack, British Columbia?

2. By whom were these tenders submitted?

3. What was the amount of each tender?

No. 34—*Mr. Patterson*

March 18—1. How many tenders were submitted for the remodelling and extension of the Post Office at Mission City, British Columbia?

2. By whom were these tenders submitted?
3. What was the amount of each tender?

No. 35—*Mr. Castleden*

March 18—What are the requirements of grain content of No. 1 feed screenings, as certified by the Board of Grain Commissioners?

No. 36—*Mr. Dinsdale*

March 18—1. What aircraft are operated by the Department of Transport?

2. What services do these aircraft perform?
3. Are they used to transport Government officials, and, if so, how many times has this occurred during the past?
4. Are they used to transport Members of the Government, and, if so, how many times has this occurred during the past fiscal year?

No. 37—*Mr. Dinsdale*

March 18—1. Do Department of Transport aircraft pay the regular storage fees for aircraft stored at government civil airports?

2. If not, how is the cost of this storage defrayed?

No. 38—*Mr. Dinsdale*

March 18—1. Has the Department of Transport placed an order for a Vickers Viscount aircraft?

2. If so, what is the cost of such an aircraft, and what functions will it perform?

No. 39—*Mr. Michener*

March 18—1. How many cases by the following classes have been heard and decided upon by the present Tariff Board since its appointment: (a) appeals by importers; (b) appeals by other interested parties; (c) references by the Deputy Minister of National Revenue; (d) references by the Minister of Finance?

2. Of such cases in classes (a), (b) and (c), above, how many by each class (i) have been decided in favour of the importer; (ii) have been decided in favour of the interested party other than the importer?

3. Of the cases decided upon by the present Tariff Board (a) how many applications have been requested for leave to appeal to the Exchequer Court; (b) in how many instances has the Exchequer Court granted the applicant leave to appeal?

No. 40—*Mr. Buchanan*

March 18—1. What assistance, through federal subventions, has been given to the movement of coal from the Maritimes westward to other provinces in the following fiscal years: 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

2. What is the breakdown of amounts on shipments from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for each of the above years?

3. Has any change in policy or the payment of these subventions taken place during the above years? If so, when and in what form?

4. Are figures available to show coal shipments from the Cape Breton area? If so, what quantities, and what is the amount of subventions in each of the above years?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

1955

No. 1*

February 25—*Mr. Dinsdale*—ORDER OF THE HOUSE—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, memoranda and other communications in the possession of the Department of Defence Production, relating to the operation of the small defence industries branch of the Department of Defence Production and its discontinuation in 1954.

No. 2*

March 11—*Mr. Hodgson*—ADDRESS—For a copy of all telegrams, letters or other communications or correspondence exchanged between the Department of the Secretary of State and the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to the proposal that a Canadian Pacific Railway Continental train be named "Royal Canadian".

No. 3*

March 14—*Mr. Knowles*—ADDRESS—For a copy of all communications from or on behalf of organizations dated at any time since July 1, 1954, received by the Government, or any Minister thereof, respecting the unemployment situation in Canada, and for a copy of the replies thereto.

No. 4*

March 18—*Mr. Girard*—ORDER OF THE HOUSE—For a copy of all telegrams, letters, memoranda and other communications in the possession of the Department of Transport, relating to the application for a television station at Jonquière.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTIONS

1955

March 15—*The Minister of Transport*—That a Sessional Committee on Railways and Shipping owned, operated and controlled by the Government, be appointed to consider the accounts and estimates and bills relating thereto of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, and Trans-Canada Air Lines, saving always the powers of the Committee of Supply in relation to the voting of public moneys; and that the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers, and records and to report from time to time and that, notwithstanding Standing Order 65 in relation to the limitation of the number of members, the said Committee consist of Messrs: Bell, Carrick, Carter, Cavers, Churchill, Dumas, Fahey, Follwell, Fulton, Gillis, Hahn, Hamilton (Notre-Dame-de-Grace), Hanna, Harrison, Healy, James, Johnston (Bow River), Knight, Langlois (Gaspé), Lavigne, Legare, Macdonnell (Greenwood), McCulloch (Pictou), Murphy (Westmorland), Pouliot, Weaver.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

NOTE.—The letters E.F. denote those printed and distributed in both languages when the Orders were printed; E, printed in English, F, in French.

1955

No. 1.

March 17—Third Reading of Bill No. 195 (Letter D of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to amend The Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners Act".—*The Minister of Transport.*

No. 2.

March 18—Third Reading of Bill No. 242 (Letter O-8 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to amend the Criminal Code".—*The Minister of Justice.*

No. 3.

March 18—Third Reading of Bill No. 245, An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act.—*The Minister of Trade and Commerce.*

No. 4.

March 16—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of the Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself again into Committee of Supply, and on the proposed Amendment thereto of Mrs. Fairclough, and on the Amendment to the Amendment of Mr. Regier.

No. 5.

February 4—House in Committee of Ways and Means.—*The Minister of Finance.*

No. 6.

January 11—Second Reading of Bill No. 5, An Act to amend the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act.—*The Minister of Agriculture.—E.F.*

No. 7.

January 11—IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE—The following proposed Resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to introduce a measure to implement the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between Canada and the United States, signed at Washington on the 10th of September, 1954, and to provide that the

Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out and giving effect to the provisions of the Convention and anything done by the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission to be established thereunder.—*The Minister of Fisheries.*

No. 8.

February 1—IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE—The following proposed Resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to introduce a measure to consolidate the various enactments relating to Canadian National Railways into one statute, also, to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may operate a telecommunication system, to authorize officers and employees of the Canadian National Railways to act as directors of partially-owned companies, to authorize the Company to construct short lines without specific parliamentary authority and to operate motor vehicles and further to make provisions for extinguishing charters of constituent corporations.—*The Minister of Transport.*

No. 9.

February 15—IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE—The following proposed Resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Blind Persons Act to lower the age for eligible recipients from twenty-one years to eighteen years, and also to increase the maximum annual incomes allowed to recipients.—*The Minister of National Health and Welfare.*

No. 10.

February 24—Second Reading of Bill No. 179, An Act to amend the Northwest Territories Act.—*The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.—E.F.*

No. 11.

February 24—Second Reading of Bill No. 180, An Act to amend the Yukon Act.—*The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.—E.F.*

No. 12.

February 28—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources for the Second Reading of Bill No. 182, An Act to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act.

No. 13.

February 28—Second Reading of Bill No. 188, An Act to amend the Government Employees Compensation Act.—*The Minister of Labour.—E.F.*

No. 14.

February 28—Second Reading of Bill No. 189, An Act to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act.—*The Minister of Finance.—E.F.*

No. 15.

March 18—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys for the Second Reading of Bill No. 190, An Act to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act.

No. 16.

March 4—Second Reading of Bill No. 192 (Letter B of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to amend the Library of Parliament Act".—*The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.*—E.F.

No. 17.

March 14—Second Reading of Bill No. 256, An Act to amend the Defence Production Act.—*The Prime Minister.*—E.F.

No. 18.

March 14—Second Reading of Bill No. 257, An Act respecting the Canadian Forces.—*The Minister of National Defence.*—E.F.

No. 19.

March 17—Second Reading of Bill No. 258, An Act to amend the Municipal Grants Act.—*The Minister of Finance.*

No. 20.

March 17—Second Reading of Bill No. 259, An Act to amend the Railway Act.—*The Minister of Transport.*

No. 21.

March 17—Second Reading of Bill No. 260, An Act to amend the Radio Act.—*The Minister of Transport.*

No. 22.

March 17—Second Reading of Bill No. 261, An Act to amend the National Parks Act and to establish a National Park in the Province of Newfoundland.—*The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.*

No. 23.

March 18—Second Reading of Bill No. 262, An Act to approve an agreement between The Toronto Harbour Commissioners, The Toronto Terminals Railway Company, Canadian National Railway Company and Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—*The Minister of Transport.*

PRIVATE BILLS

NOTE.—The letters E.F. denote those printed and distributed in both languages when the Orders were printed; E, printed in English, F, in French.

1955

No. 24.

March 16—Second Reading of Bill No. 243 (Letter C-8 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to incorporate Caledonian-Canadian Insurance Company".—*Mr. Hunter.*—E.F.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

1955

No. 5

January 7—*Mr. Zaplitny*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of extending the present designated area set out under the terms of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, so as to include all agricultural areas in the four western provinces.

No. 6

January 7—*Mr. Castleden*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into early consideration the advisability of appointing a board of live stock commissioners in Canada for the purpose of regulating and controlling the assembling, grading, transporting, marketing and exporting of livestock and livestock products, and that such board should include adequate representation appointed on the recommendation of the producers' organizations.

No. 7

January 7—*Mr. Philpott*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the growth of the narcotic drug menace in Canada, including its relationship to crime in general and its debauchery of youth in particular; and to study all techniques of preventing and curtailing drug addiction, as well as methods of treating drug addicts including those employed at Lexington, Kentucky.

No. 8

January 7—*Mr. MacKenzie*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of a conference with the Provincial Government of Ontario, at an early date, regarding the construction of a bridge over the Snye River, connecting Walpole Island and the main land near the town of Wallaceburg, to facilitate road traffic at this point.

No. 9

January 7—*Mr. Dupuis*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of entering into negotiations with the government of the Province of Quebec for the purpose of reaching a mutual agreement for the abolition of tolls on the Jacques Cartier bridge.

No. 10

January 7—*Mr. Charlton*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking steps to further protect the health of the nation by requiring all

trucks, tractors, busses, or any other diesel powered vehicles, including engines on railway lines, and all stationary type of engines, be equipped with a device to render harmless, poisonous gases emitted from the exhaust of such vehicles or engines.

No. 11

January 7—*Mr. Richard* (Ottawa East)—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of setting up a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament, to consider the operations of the Federal District Commission, the National Capital Plan and the relationship between the Government of Canada and municipalities included in the National Capital Plan.

No. 12

January 7—*Mr. McMillan*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Unemployment Insurance Act so as to increase the regular and supplementary benefits to single and married unemployed workers.

No. 13

January 7—*Mr. Fraser* (St. John's East)—The following proposed Resolution:—That in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of accepting the offer, made by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland, of the Signal Hill area at St. John's, to be developed as an historic national park.

No. 14

January 7—*Mr. Hollingworth*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to provide national scholarships and bursaries for students at the university level who are in financial need, insofar as the subject matter of this resolution is within the competence of Parliament.

No. 15

January 7—*Mr. Gauthier* (Lac-Saint-Jean)—The following proposed Resolution:—That in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking whatever steps are necessary for the early construction of the Eastern section of the St. Felicien-Chibougamau-Beattyville railway, for the purpose of connecting the Lake St. John industrial district with the Chibougamau mining centre.

No. 16

January 7—*Mr. Bertrand*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of having a survey made by the Department of National Health and Welfare of the number of blind persons in Canada; examine into the possibility of enacting a National Act providing allowances for these persons, or if the present allowance scheme is to be continued with the co-operation of the provinces, examine, in conjunction with the provinces, the possibility of abolishing the means test.

No. 17

January 7—*Mr. Crestohl*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act so as to provide for the exemption from income taxes of tuition fees paid to universities, vocational training schools, military colleges, academies and other institutions of higher learning, as well as the costs to students of all text books and scientific equipment necessary to the courses followed in these institutions of learning.

No. 18

January 7—*Mr. Hellyer*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of setting up a special select committee of this House to study the whole subject of conservation in Canada and to make recommendations with reference to co-ordinating the various conservation authorities to assist them in their task of preventing future disasters similar to that caused by hurricane Hazel.

No. 19

January 10—*Mr. McLeod*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers of great war one who hold land under contract with the Soldier Settlement Board.

No. 20

January 10—*Mr. Dinsdale*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking advantage of every possible opportunity to promote the decentralization of industry, particularly with reference to defence industry, thereby,

(1) helping to reverse the trend towards concentration of population in large metropolitan areas with the accompanying social evils;

(2) encouraging a more equitable distribution of population and development right across Canada, and

(3) assuring the strategic dispersal of vital war industries in the interests of National defence.

No. 21

January 11—*Mr. McCullough* (Moose Mountain)—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of setting up a special committee of parliament for the purpose of investigating the production, sale and distribution of fertilizer and its components.

No. 22

January 11—*Mr. Bell*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of setting up a select special committee of this House, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to consider the subject of the merchant navy in Canada and to make a report to this House, with special direction to

consider and report on the present number and state of Canadian ships, the necessity for a merchant navy in both peace and war, the effect on Canada's trade of a merchant navy and the means by which the proper development and expansion of the merchant navy may be administered.

No. 23

February 1—*Mr. Balcer*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking whatever steps are necessary for the early construction of a railway line between La Malbaie, in Charlevoix County, and the southern terminal of The Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway at Seven Islands, in Saguenay County.

No. 24

February 10—*Mr. Nicholson*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking steps to arrange a meeting between the Prime Minister of Canada, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the heads of the administrations of The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the purpose of considering the problems created by the hydrogen bomb, the control and reduction of armaments, and devising policies and means for strengthening of collective peace through the United Nations Organization.

No. 25

February 11—*Mr. Barnett*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of establishing a national insurance plan to cover individuals against the dislocations caused by technological advances, changed marketing conditions and other related causes.

No. 26

February 14—*Mr. Gillis*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of the establishment of a national fuels policy to correlate coal, electricity, natural gas and oil, so that they may be used in their proper economic areas throughout the country.

No. 27

February 28—*Mr. Diefenbaker*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should take into consideration the advisability of extending the right to deduct for tax exemption purposes payments made to pension plans by self-employed persons, and by employees who have not access to a satisfactory approved pension plan.

No. 28

March 10—*Mr. McWilliam*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of setting firm dates for the commencement, duration and completion of the East Coast smelt fishing season, with the end in view of stabilizing prices throughout the season and bringing about a more orderly system of marketing.

No. 29

March 10—*Mr. Trainor*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should give consideration to the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act so as to provide that the taxpayer shall at his option be entitled to deduct from his taxable income either (a) his medical expenses as now determined; (b) the premiums paid by him for insurance against sickness or accident or both; (c) the specific provincial tax paid by him under any provincial scheme of health insurance.

No. 30

March 16—*Mr. Boisvert*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of setting up a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament, to consider the construction of tunnels rather than bridges on the St. Lawrence River, at various places where necessary, insofar as the subject matter of this resolution is within the competence of Parliament.

No. 31

March 17—*Mr. Knowles*—The following proposed Resolution:—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should give consideration to the setting up of a 100th anniversary committee, with provision for participation by representatives of the federal and the provincial governments, for the purpose of planning the economic and social development of this country on a vast scale, including housing, slum clearance, conservation, irrigation and power projects, highway construction, the elimination of grade crossings, the building of hospitals, assistance to municipal projects, other public works and the strengthening of the economy of every section of the country; and that consideration should be given to the advisability of such a program being launched immediately and being pursued vigorously year by year so that on July 1, 1967, the people of Canada will be in a position to celebrate this nation's 100th birthday not only with fireworks and speeches but by the achievement of a land of health and abundance for all our people.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

NOTE.—The letters E.F. denote those printed and distributed in both languages when the Orders were printed; E, printed in English, F, in French.

1955

No. 25.

March 9—Resuming Debate on the Motion of *Mr. Fulton*:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of an immediate investigation into the reasons why the spread between prices paid to the producer for top grade beef and those paid for lower grades is not accompanied by a corresponding choice of prices required to be paid by consumers, and into the question of whether there is an abuse under the present system of grading, and into the methods whereby such abuse can be eliminated.

No. 26.

February 3—Second Reading of Bill No. 21, An Act respecting Flags of Canada.—*Mr. Hollingworth*.—E.F.

No. 27.

February 4—Second Reading of Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Canada Grain Act. (Distribution of Box Cars).—*Mr. Argue*.—E.F.

No. 28.

February 7—Resuming Debate on the Motion of *Mr. Diefenbaker*:—That, in the opinion of this House, immediate consideration should be given to the advisability of introducing a bill or declaration of rights to assure amongst other rights:

1. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and of radio;
2. That Habeas Corpus shall not be abrogated or suspended except by parliament;
3. That no one shall be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law, and in no case by order in council;
4. That no tribunal or commission shall have the power to compel the giving of evidence by any one who is denied counsel or other constitutional safeguards.

And that as a preliminary step the government should consider the advisability of submitting for the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada the question as to the degree of which fundamental freedoms of religion, speech and of the press and the preservation of the constitutional rights of the individual are matters of federal or provincial jurisdiction, and on the proposed Amendment thereto of *Mr. Coldwell*.

No. 29.

February 9—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. Knight:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take into consideration the advisability of taking steps to relieve the financial crisis in education, without encroaching in any way on the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces in this field, by granting financial assistance to the various provinces for the expansion and equalization of educational opportunity across Canada.

No. 30.

February 16—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. Herridge:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of calling a Dominion-Provincial Conference on conservation with a view to the establishment of a national policy on soil, forest and water conservation and land use for Canada.

No. 31.

February 21—Resuming Debate on the Motion of Mr. Campbell:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to double the payments to farmers under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

No. 32.

February 22—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. Fulton for the Second Reading of Bill No. 8, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act. (Misbranding).

No. 33.

February 23—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. Argue:—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of introducing legislation to provide an increase in the family allowance.

No. 34.

March 2—Second Reading of Bill No. 191, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1952, with respect to the Tenure of Place in the Senate.—*Mr. Follwell.*—E.F.

No. 35.

March 4—Resuming the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. Knowles for the Second Reading of Bill No. 163, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

No. 36.

March 11—Resuming Debate on the Motion of Mr. Thomas for the Second Reading of Bill No. 185, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act. (Ballot Papers).

No. 37.

March 18—Resuming Debate on the Motion of Mr. Diefenbaker for the Second Reading of Bill No. 186, An Act to amend the Criminal Code. (Nuisance).

Merv. said:

university

*1 ? 2 ?
we have
an old*

"Ask what number of students enrolled
for Nova Scotia?"

What total amount was paid in Massey
Grants to Nova Scotia?"

*What did each University in Nova
Scotia receive
Nfld.*

Then all you have to do is divide grant
by number of students.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

No. 32 - Mr. Hardie

Question: Under the Massey Grant Recommendations, what payment was made per university student for each province in (a) 1953-54; (b) 1954-55 to date?

Answer:

It is presumed that this question refers to grants made to universities under authority of Vote 121 of the Appropriation Act, 1953 and 119 of the Appropriation Act, 1954.

Grants are not made on a per student basis. The grants amount to 50 cents per head of population in each province and are divided among the approved institutions in each province in proportion to their respective student enrolments.

Ottawa, March 21, 1955.

*ask ?
Total paid cash
provision on
Massey Grants
except Alberta.*

*What
Hanna ?*

Review a ?

File Massey Grants

*Mrs W
Walter
off - compiled
Mabsey Grants*



*Students as
shown by a previous
mine*

Ottawa 4,
June 28, 1955.

*But could insert number
shown by a previous
question*

Mr. S. R. Balcom, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Balcom:

In reply to your
letter of June 22nd, I am attaching a
table showing the grants to universities
in the Maritime provinces as provided
by Vote 119 of the Estimates for the
fiscal year 1954-55.

Yours very truly,

W. E. Harris

*Min T. I have
could about 5
asked
Valhalla*

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

NEW BRUNSWICK

	<u>Amount of Grant</u>
Universite du Sacre-Coeur	\$10,064.80
St. Thomas College	8,697.30
Universite Saint Louis	17,777.50
University of New Brunswick	106,035.95
Mount Allison University	99,061.70
Universite Saint Joseph	31,862.75

5

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

NOVA SCOTIA

Amount of
Grant

*No
Students*

St. Francis Xavier University	\$86,682.40
College Sainte-Anne	5,888.75
Dalhousie University (including King's College and Maritime College of Pharmacy)	115,049.35
Maritime School of Social Work	1,716.15
Mount Saint Vincent College	19,685.25
Nova Scotia Technical College	16,286.60
Pine Hill Divinity Hall	4,340.85
Sacred Heart Convent	1,211.40
St. Mary's University	21,636.95
Nova Scotia Agricultural College	5,451.30
Acadia University	49,936.60
Holy Heart Seminary	8,614.40

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Amount of
Grant

Prince of Wales College

\$21,000.00

St. Dunstan's College

31,500.00

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

NEWFOUNDLAND

Amount of
Grant

Memorial University of
Newfoundland

\$199,000

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
HALIFAX, N. S.

FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
FORREST BUILDING

*File
Marry Grant*

May 2, 1955.

Colonel S.R. Balcom, M.P.
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Colonel Balcom;

Thank you very much indeed for sending me a copy of the official report on the House of Commons Debates on Tuesday, April 19th.

Your address was read with considerable interest, particularly the references to the need for supporting universities. I would hope that your remarks would soon bear fruit.

One point which may be of interest to you is that while in the past the proportion of operating costs borne by a student in dentistry was approximately 33%, it is our feeling that if we were able to do more of the things which we feel we ought to be doing (continuing to exercise strict economy) the figure would be closer to 20% on the basis of our present classes.

When we are fortunate enough to be able to accommodate twice the number of students, unquestionably the percentage would improve, but it is not likely that we could expect the student to pay much more than 25% of the operating costs without raising the fees to the point of excluding all but the sons of the wealthy.

Your continuing interest is greatly appreciated.

With kindest personal regards,

Yours sincerely,

J. D. McLean

J.D. McLean,
Dean.

JDM/L.

Volume 97
Number 60

2nd Session
22nd Parliament



CANADA

2563

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, March 31, 1955

Speaker: The Honourable L. Rene Beaudoin

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

Price per copy, 5 cents; per session, \$3. Address Queen's Printer, Ottawa, Canada.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 31, 1955

Privilege. Mr. Drew—Reference to press report of remarks in house. Mr. Coldwell.....	2561
Defence Production.	
Statement respecting production cut and lay-offs at A. V. Roe plant. Mr. Gregg....	2561
CF-100 planes—Use by NATO countries. Mr. Hamilton (York West), Mr. Pearson, Mr. Howe (Port Arthur).....	2562
Public Buildings. R.C.M.P. headquarters, Overbrook—Tabling of rental and purchase agreements. Mr. Bourget.....	2562
Answers to Questions Asked by: Mr. Dufresne, Mr. Kickham, Mr. MacLean, Mr. Johnson (Kindersley), Mr. Balcom.....	2562
Broadcasting. Inquiry as to appointment of independent regulatory body. Mr. Fleming, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. St. Laurent.....	2564
Labour Conditions. Bureau of statistics reports—Reference to reported remarks of Prime Minister. Mr. Drew, Mr. St. Laurent.....	2564
National Defence. Defence of Canadian north—Reference to remarks of Minister of National Defence. Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North), Mr. St. Laurent.....	2564
Health Insurance. Inquiry as to introduction by government. Mr. Knowles, Mr. Martin....	2564
Natural Gas.	
Request for construction of pipe line to serve Winnipeg. Mr. Trainor, Mr. Howe (Port Arthur).....	2565
Request for statement on present position. Mr. Drew, Mr. Howe (Port Arthur).....	2565
Trade. GATT—Inquiry as to printing of agreements. Mr. Fleming, Mr. Howe (Port Arthur)..	2565
Canso Causeway. Announcement of date of opening ceremonies. Mr. Marler.....	2565
Taxation. Eligibility of welfare organizations for sales tax refunds. Mr. Knowles, Mr. Harris..	2565
War Veterans Allowance Act. Amendments to increase allowances and permissible income, etc. Bill No. 164, Mr. Lapointe, further considered in committee.....	2566
Bill reported, read the third time and passed.....	2594
Northwest Territories Act. Increase in indemnity of council members. Bill No. 179. Motion, Mr. Lesage, for second reading, agreed to. Bill read the second time and considered in committee.....	2594
Bill reported, read the third time and passed.....	2594
Yukon Act. Amendments respecting living allowance and attendance of council members. Bill No. 180. Motion, Mr. Lesage, for second reading, agreed to. Bill read the second time and considered in committee.....	2594
Bill reported, read the third time and passed.....	2595

CONTENTS—Concluded

Historic Sites and Monuments Act. Amendments respecting definitions, travelling expenses, etc. Bill No. 182. Consideration resumed of motion of Mr. Lesage for second reading.....	2595
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Fraser (St. John's East).....	2595
Mr. Nowlan.....	2596
Mr. Purdy.....	2599
Mr. Hahn.....	2600
Mr. Harkness.....	2602
Mr. Forgie.....	2602
Mr. Robichaud.....	2603
Mr. Murphy (Westmorland).....	2604
Motion (Mr. Lesage) agreed to. Bill read the second time and considered in committee.....	2605
Progress reported.....	2605
Royal Assent given by the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General.....	2605
Business of the House	2605

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

CHANGE IN PERSONNEL OF SESSIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. W. G. Weir (Portage-Neepawa) moved:

That the name of Mr. Hamilton (York West) be substituted for that of Mr. Macdonnell on the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 31, 1955

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Government House,
Ottawa, 31st March, 1955.

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber on Thursday, the 31st March, at 9.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
sir,

Your obedient servant,
J. F. Delaute,
Secretary to the Governor General
(Administrative).

PRIVILEGE

MR. DREW—REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT OF
REMARKS IN HOUSE

Hon. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I feel it appropriate that I should deal with this matter in the House of Commons in view of the fact that a statement appears in the press today relating to something I said in the house the day before yesterday. It is stated that I indicated I believed there should be restrictions on the free exchange of views between nations. The statement refers to remarks I made expressing the hope that the Right Hon. Clement Attlee was not coming here under the auspices of a political party to engage in Canadian political affairs.

I can assure hon. members to the left, as well as other hon. members, that no one in Canada will join in a warmer welcome to the Right Hon. Clement Attlee any time he comes here as a distinguished citizen of Great Britain. He deserves our recognition of his great service during and since the war. But I pointed out at that time not that there should be any restriction on anyone expressing his views but rather that there is a tradition which has not been broken since confederation, that the head of the government and the leader of the opposition—always

a possible occupant of the position of prime minister—should not engage in the political activities of other nations of the commonwealth because of the fact that as heads of governments they may be dealing with heads of other governments, and should be free from political entanglements.

I certainly did not criticize Mr. Attlee, nor did I criticize the C.C.F. party for extending the invitation. I expressed the hope that the report was incorrect, and I would still hope that the Right Hon. Clement Attlee, one of the most distinguished Britons of these days, would not break a tradition that goes back to confederation and which is based on extremely sound grounds for the reasons I have indicated.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): May I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I think it would be well to reserve any criticisms that he feels he should make until Mr. Attlee is in the country and we have had an opportunity to hear what he has to say.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

STATEMENT RESPECTING PRODUCTION CUT AND
LAY-OFFS AT A. V. ROE PLANT

Hon. Milton F. Gregg (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, following the questions asked in the house yesterday by the hon. member for Peel and the hon. member for York West regarding future lay-offs of workers at the Avro plant, and also questions put to me outside the house by the president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the Minister of Defence Production and I have agreed that this brief statement should be made in the house today.

As hon. members know, the Avro company has for some time been producing planes of the type known as the CF-100 to fill orders to meet the requirements of the Department of National Defence. Having regard to the number of these planes now required and on order, the company has found it necessary to put into effect a progressive cut-back in the rate of production which will involve a reduction of the company's work force by approximately 1,000 men over the three-month period of May, June and July next. I am advised that the new production schedule which is planned will become effective after the annual holiday period in the plant in August. The company is engaged in

engineering and advance planning work on a new plane, but a considerable period of time must necessarily elapse before actual production of this plane can be expected.

When the representatives of the workers at Avro met with the Minister of Defence Production and myself early in the year they expressed criticism of the very short notice that had been given with regard to the lay-offs that had taken place just after Christmas. Because of this the delegation was informed that the Avro company would be given the necessary information to enable advance notice to be given to the workers with regard to any future lay-offs. That is why the present notices have been sent out as far in advance of the actual lay-off dates as possible.

The national employment service will obtain immediately full particulars of those who are to be laid off and their qualifications, and I can assure the house that every effort will be made by that service to assist them to find new employment.

[Later:]

CF-100 PLANES—USE BY NATO COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. B. Hamilton (York West): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs arising out of an answer given by the Minister of Labour in connection with the employment situation at A. V. Roe. Does the cutback in A. V. Roe employment in connection with the production of the CF-100 indicate that the member countries of NATO—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Hamilton (York West): —are not interested in this plane for augmenting their air squadrons?

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I was not able to catch the last part of the question. Perhaps my hon. friend would repeat it.

Mr. Hamilton (York West): If the minister's friends would be quiet for a minute, he would be able to hear it.

An hon. Member: It should be on the order paper, anyway.

Mr. Hamilton (York West): Does the cutback in the production of CF-100's at A. V. Roe indicate that the member nations of NATO are not interested in this plane for augmenting their air squadrons.

Mr. Pearson: I do not think that question needs to be answered by me, Mr. Speaker. It probably concerns the Minister of Defence Production if anybody, but there is certainly no indication that any member of NATO is

[Mr. Gregg.]

not interested in any piece of Canadian equipment which would aid in the collective defence.

[Later:]

Mr. Hamilton (York West): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Defence Production. Has the minister any knowledge of any orders for CF-100 planes from any of the nations in NATO?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Defence Production): I know of no orders from any nation other than Canada.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

R.C.M.P. HEADQUARTERS, OVERBROOK—TABLING OF RENTAL AND PURCHASE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Maurice Bourget (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Public Works): In accordance with an undertaking given by the Minister of Finance yesterday I am tabling herewith photostatic copies of the rental agreement and subsequent purchase agreement in respect of the building occupied by the R.C.M.P. in Overbrook.

QUESTIONS

C.N.R., QUEBEC—TRAIN SERVICE AND STATIONS

Mr. Dufresne:

1. Has the Canadian National Railways decided to close the railway stations at St. Stanislas and St. Adelphe, in the county of Champlain, Ste. Elizabeth, in the county of Joliette, Ste. Perpetue, in the county of Kamouraska, St. Joseph du lac, in the county of Nicolet, and Villemontel, in the county of Abitibi?

2. Has the Canadian National Railways decided to cancel the day train between Quebec city and Garneau, via St. Prosper?

3. If so, will steps be taken to protect the travelling public of the said localities?

Mr. Langlois (Gaspé):

The Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. A decision has been made to close the agency and appoint a caretaker at Ste. Perpetue, county of Kamouraska, and application will be made to the board of transport commissioners for the necessary authority.

No decision has been taken in respect of the other agencies mentioned.

2. Canadian National Railways trains 697 and 698 operating between Quebec city and Garneau via St. Prosper have been cancelled, effective February 27, 1955.

3. There is frequent and adequate highway service in the area so that public convenience is protected.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND HOSPITAL GRANTS

Mr. Kickham:

What federal grants have been made to each of the hospitals in the province of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Robertson:

Under the national health grants program, federal grants have been made to the following hospitals in Prince Edward Island:

(a) Under the hospital construction grant:

	Amount of grant
Western Memorial hospital, Alberton	\$ 8,280.25
Charlottetown hospital, Charlottetown	88,139.67
Falconwood hospital, Charlottetown	133,790.00
Prince Edward Island hospital Charlottetown	20,000.00
Kings County Memorial hospital, Montague	8,500.00
Prince County hospital, Summerside	188,554.65
Stewart Memorial health centre, Tyne Valley	8,000.00
Charlottetown health centre, Charlottetown	5,996.27

(b) Under the other federal health grants:

	Expenditures 1948-55
Falconwood Mental hospital, Charlottetown	\$ 102,470.00
Provincial sanatorium, Charlottetown	105,450.00

KOREAN REHABILITATION

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley):

1. Is Canada supplying goods intended to aid in the rehabilitation of Korea?

2. If so, under what program or programs is such aid supplied?

3. What is the value of goods shipped for such purpose by calendar years since the beginning of the Korean war?

4. Is the government considering substantially increasing its economic assistance to aid in Korean rehabilitation?

5. Has the government any information with respect to Korean profiteers preventing the proper distribution of United States' aid intended to facilitate Korean rehabilitation?

6. Is the government aware of any such incidents involving Canadian aid?

7. If so, what steps has the government taken to ensure that any economic aid does, in fact, achieve its purpose?

Mr. Pearson:

1. Yes. The government of Canada has aided Korean relief and rehabilitation by making available financial assistance and gifts of cod fish. A substantial part of the financial support has been spent on Canadian goods.

2. The financial assistance in 1 above was given to the United Nations Korean reconstruction agency which was established by the United Nations general assembly in 1950 in order to assist in the long-range rehabilitation of the Korean economy. The Canadian salted cod was donated to the United Nations emergency relief program which is carried out by the United Nations command and which provides immediate aid in the form of food, clothing, etc.

3. A Canadian cash contribution of \$7,250,000 was made to UNKRA in March, 1951. The first contribution of salted cod, valued at \$300,000, was made in the fall of 1953. A second contribution, valued at \$450,000, was made in the spring of 1954.

4. The Canadian government has recommended that an additional cash contribution of \$500,000 be made to UNKRA for its current financial year. This recommendation was approved by the House of Commons on March 25, 1955. No consideration is being given to further contributions at this time.

5. The Canadian government is not in a position to answer a question of this kind which concerns matters falling within the jurisdiction of the United States and Korean governments.

6. No.

7. —

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS

Mr. Balcom:

1. By provinces, how much has been paid to the institutions of higher learning under vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 estimates?

2. By provinces, what were the number of students deemed eligible for calculation in connection with vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 estimates?

Mr. Harris:

	(1) Payments to eligible institutions	(2) Number of eligible students
Newfoundland	\$ 199,000	505
Prince Edw. Island ..	52,500	245
Nova Scotia	336,500	3,948
New Brunswick	273,500	2,231
Quebec	—	—
Ontario	2,523,000	17,896
Manitoba	414,000	4,171
Saskatchewan	439,000	2,694
Alberta	519,500	3,297
British Columbia	633,000	6,005

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AIRDROMES

Mr. MacLean:

1. How many airdromes operated by the Department of Transport employ ground-controlled approach (G.C.A.) equipment?

2. How many airdromes operated by the Department of Transport are equipped with high intensity lighting?

Mr. Langlois (Gaspe):

1. 4.
2. 6.

Note: The foregoing do not include airports which are municipally operated or military airports used by civil aviation.

BROADCASTING

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT REGULATORY BODY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): May I ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Revenue whether the government intends to appoint a commission to consider bringing Canadian radio and television broadcasting under an independent regulatory tribunal or body, as recommended yesterday by the advisory council of the national Liberal federation, whose committee on resolutions was presided over by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill)?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I have not yet received the resolution.

[Later:]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): May I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he will be good enough to communicate to the Prime Minister the resolution to which I referred earlier, so we may ask the Prime Minister whether the commission will be appointed by the government as proposed by the national Liberal federation?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I know of no competence I have in this matter.

Mr. Fulton: Or any other.

[Later:]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wonder if the Prime Minister would advise the house whether, having regard to the experience with radio, he considers an independent board desirable or necessary?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): My personal opinion is that it is not desirable nor necessary, but that is my personal opinion. As I recollect the terms of the Massey report there was a recommendation that after a period a further examination be made of the question, but I am still

[Mr. MacLean.]

more impressed by the recommendations of the majority of that commission than by the minority report.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BUREAU OF STATISTICS REPORTS—REFERENCE TO REPORTED REMARKS OF PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. I wonder if, in view of the reports of what he said last night, he would regard the reports of the dominion bureau of statistics concerning the employment situation in the textile, electrical, footwear and other industries, as undermining public confidence?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I would hope not, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DEFENCE OF CANADIAN NORTH—REFERENCE TO REMARKS OF MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Alistair Stewart (Winnipeg North): In the absence of the Minister of National Defence I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In the light of the answer given yesterday to the hon. member for Kootenay West, can the Prime Minister tell me if it is now the intention of the government to have Iceland defend the northern frontiers of Canada, in view of reports appearing in the newspapers?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I have never heard the suggestion and I am sure, from the relations I have had with the government of Iceland, that they will make no such suggestion to us.

HEALTH INSURANCE

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION BY GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare? In view of the resolution passed yesterday by the advisory council of the national Liberal federation, will the government proceed soon with the introduction of national health insurance?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I am not quite as busy as the Prime Minister, and on that account I have had a chance to see this resolution. My hon. friend asked me the same question last

TRADE

GATT—INQUIRY AS TO PRINTING OF AGREEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what arrangements are being made for the printing of copies of the documents he tabled in the house on Monday pertaining to the trade agreements reached at Geneva, so hon. members may have copies for study as soon as possible.

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I shall have to accept that question as notice. It is my impression arrangements have been made for printing the documents, but I would have to check with my office to make sure.

CANSO CAUSEWAY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATE OF OPENING CEREMONIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George C. Marler (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, on Monday the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond (Mr. MacEachen) asked whether a date had been selected for the official opening of the Canso causeway. I should now like to inform him and other hon. members that upon the recommendation of a committee consisting of representatives of the government of Nova Scotia, the Canadian National Railways and my department, August 13 has been definitely set for the opening ceremonies.

It was considered that the formal opening of the causeway would be a fitting climax to the tourist season in Nova Scotia, and if held on that date would not interfere with other events such as the gathering of the clans of Pugwash, the highland games at Antigonish, the Gaelic Mod at St. Anns and the Acadian bi-centenary at Grand Pré and Annapolis Royal.

It is our intention to allow highway traffic to use the causeway as soon as the swing bridge over the canal has been completed and the other work has reached a stage where this traffic will not interfere unduly with construction activities.

TAXATION

ELIGIBILITY OF WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS FOR SALES TAX REFUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Finance? Has he received requests that all social welfare organizations

year, and my reply then was that this government and the actions of the national Liberal federation are always consistent.

Mr. Knowles: Will that still be the reply 36 years from now?

NATURAL GAS

REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE TO SERVE WINNIPEG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. O. C. Trainor (Winnipeg South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the adequate supply of natural gas in Alberta, and in view of the willingness of private interests to construct a pipe line to Winnipeg, how long is he going to deny the citizens of Winnipeg the use of natural gas?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. member has based his question on information that is not in my possession. I am afraid I cannot answer his question.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

Hon. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the very great and natural interest shown throughout the whole of Canada, and particularly in western Canada, in regard to prospects for the transmission of gas from the Alberta fields, may I ask if it is the intention of the minister before he leaves for Australia to give a statement to this house in regard to the present situation, informing us what are the facts, in the light of certain statements that have already been issued by one of the companies primarily concerned, and others.

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am hardly in a position to make a statement of that kind. Trans-Canada Pipe Lines are still carrying on with their project. They have negotiations under way in several quarters. I had an interview a day or two ago with some of the directors, and they gave me certain information which I would not feel free to pass along at this stage. However, I can assure hon. members that as soon as there is a positive statement to be made I shall be very glad to make it. But to report on negotiations now in progress would be hardly fair to the directors of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines.

be made eligible for sales tax refunds, and if so is he giving consideration to such requests?

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): I think this request has been made at least in each of the last seven years to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Knowles: Is the minister giving consideration to the matter between now and Tuesday night?

WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE ACT

AMENDMENTS TO INCREASE ALLOWANCES AND PERMISSIBLE INCOME, ETC.

The house resumed, from Wednesday, March 30, consideration in committee of Bill No. 164, to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act, 1952—Mr. Lapointe—Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

On clause 1—*Definitions*.

Mr. Gillis: Mr. Chairman, when the house adjourned last evening at six o'clock I was making some observations on clause 1 of this bill. I was a member of the committee, and I realize it is the desire of most members of the house to have this bill passed so it may receive royal assent, and so the increased rates may appear in the cheques of recipients of war veterans allowance for the month of April.

May I repeat what I said last night, that in my view the veterans affairs committee should be made a standing committee of the house.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Gillis: Am I making too much noise, Mr. Chairman? Perhaps I am disturbing some other discussions. I was saying that the veterans affairs committee should be made a standing committee of the house which could give continuing study to veterans problems as they change from time to time. This will be a continuing question, because we are going to have veterans with us for a long time.

I think the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans at this session of parliament made perhaps one of the most reasonable presentations ever made in the history of the committee. In my view everything they recommended could have been accepted and included in the bill without increasing the cost of war veterans allowances to any great extent; and I shall try to prove that as I go along.

Both the Legion and the national council recommended \$60 per month as a maximum for single veterans and \$120 as a minimum for married veterans. The bill now before us

[Mr. Knowles.]

accepts the suggestion of \$60 a month for the single veterans, as suggested in the briefs of both organizations, but it does not meet the request for \$120 for the married veterans. Under the bill before us the basic maximum for married veterans is \$108 per month, but provision is made whereby that \$108 can be brought up to \$120, through the aid of the assistance fund.

However, to receive a grant under the assistance fund it is necessary to make a second application, and it involves a second means test and investigation before the assistance can be obtained. In my judgment it would have been much cheaper and the mechanics of administration would have been definitely better if the demand of the Legion that the rate be increased to \$120 per month for married veterans had been met. I believe this would have prevented many applications for assistance from the fund, and would have obviated the necessity for a lot of administrative work, red tape and investigation. There would not have been many applications for assistance to help those in need, after payment of the \$120.

However, those who drafted the bill have not seen fit to follow this suggestion. I realize that anything we may say at this time will not affect the bill. I have in mind, however, that this is a continuing problem, and that if hon. members who sat on the committee and had the opportunity of meeting the officials and listening to statistics express their opinions at this time and have them recorded in *Hansard* so they may be read on the next occasion upon which this matter is given consideration by the government, those who are considering the matter at such time would have the benefit of those views. I am assuming, of course, that the views expressed will be reasonable and fair. I do not have in mind any wild propaganda statements. It is my desire at this time to try to put the thing in its proper perspective, as I see it, in relation to the representations made by the veterans organizations before the committee. On that particular point the basic rate is set at \$120 a month. Having regard to the over-all picture you would spend less money than you are spending now, you would prevent a lot of hardship and require much less paper and administrative work and investigation if the other angle were cleared up.

The second point that was made by both organizations, and I have made it a good many times in the house in the past, has to do with the manner in which the means test for war veterans allowance affects many people across the country who were employed in industry, in the civil service or in other

organizations. They came under superannuation schemes, contributory schemes in industry, and in that way had built up small retiring allowances for themselves that were paid over the years. When they reached the age of 65 and retired, hundreds of them—I know of many in my own part of the country who were employed in the steel and coal industry—received pensions of from \$20 a month to a maximum of \$70 a month. Very few of them receive \$70. The average would be around \$40 a month.

Many of these men are veterans. They paid for the pension or retiring allowance they are receiving from industry. By virtue of their age and their service they are qualified to come under the War Veterans Allowance Act. When they make application for war veterans allowance they find that the small retiring allowance they paid for over the years is deducted from the war veterans allowance, and in many instances they cannot obtain it at all.

What the act is doing in this regard is discouraging thrift. I have talked to many veterans during the past 10 years who have told me that they have pulled out of the contributory scheme in their companies, because they would get only so much out of it. They told me they were spending money on it, and if they pulled out of it and did not spend that money, when they reached 60 or 65 years of age they would be eligible for the maximum war veterans allowance. They questioned why they should continue to put their money into the other scheme.

It is very easy to cure that problem. It would not cost the country any money. If the ceiling on permissible income were raised, the man who is receiving a small retiring allowance of \$30, \$40, or \$50 a month, which he has paid for himself, could get both without costing the government anything at all. That should be considered.

The other point about supplementing the war veterans allowance is very good in many respects. I refer now to casual earnings, income permitted under the War Veterans Allowance Act, without interfering with the maximum paid under the act. That is very good and very generous with respect to the veteran who is in condition to take employment. But there are many sections of the country in which the casual earning provision is completely valueless. It is particularly true in my section of the country where there is nothing but heavy industry, coal mining and heavy steel work. There is no possible chance for a veteran who is physically incapacitated, either by age or in some other way, to take employment and obtain casual earnings, because there is no work in that area.

I imagine that is equally true in Hamilton, Windsor and in any section where there is heavy industry. It is all right in Ottawa where a man can get a job as an elevator operator, or in Toronto where a man can go out to the race tracks and earn a certain amount of money. A veteran can be an individual real estate operator so long as he is not working for a company. He can earn money in that way so long as he is working for himself. But in many other sections of the country casual earnings do nothing for the man at all. In these sections the casual earnings are not costing the government anything at all because they are not applicable. The only way you can give relief to recipients of the allowance is by raising the maximum payable under the act. I think \$120 is a reasonable target to shoot at.

Another point the Legion and the national council of veterans made, which I think is valid, was that the ceiling on permissible income should be raised to compare favourably with the income tax exemption levels. In addition to the maximum payable under the act, the veteran should be permitted to earn other income, and that would include small pensions and superannuation payments, to an amount equivalent to the income tax level, namely \$2,000.

Those organizations asked that the same principle be made applicable to the single veteran, up to \$1,200 a year. Their argument on that point was valid also. They pointed out that a married couple are permitted a deduction of \$2,000 for income tax purposes. There may be a young veteran who is physically handicapped and who has small children. He is in exactly the same position as the person who gets a \$2,000 exemption for income tax purposes. Today his maximum under the act, in regard to permissible earnings, is \$1,440 a year. The argument put up by both veterans organizations is valid. We should make the ceiling for permissible income under the act as close to the income tax exemption levels as possible, because the government has already set up that principle in the income tax exemptions.

Another point they made, and I think it is worthy of consideration, was that the allowance for minor children of recipients of the war veterans allowance should compare with the allowance now paid to disability pensioners under the Canadian Pension Act. I do not think there should be two classes of citizens, when it comes to payments for children, in the same department of government. That should be straightened out. There should be equality, at least in so far as the children are concerned, in the matter of allowances. The child of a recipient of war veterans allowance

and the child of a disability pensioner require exactly the same things. They have to go to school; they require the same clothes; they should have the same nourishment. It is something the government should take a look at, and they should try to wipe out the inequality as soon as possible.

The Legion made another recommendation that I have asked for in the house a good many times without very much effect. It has to do with the veterans who served in world war I and got only as far as England. When we amended the act to make veterans who served in England in world war II eligible for war veterans allowance we should have included veterans of the first great war. I say that for this reason. You meet many veterans across the country who got only as far as England in the first war. England was not considered a theatre of war at that time. Today those men are pretty well worn out; they are broken down, physically incapacitated, and they point out that this is rank discrimination so far as they are concerned. Here is a young veteran who comes back and qualifies by virtue of a physical incapacity. He may be 35 years of age, while I am 65 years of age. We both may have served in the same theatre of war. I cannot understand this differentiation between the first and the second world wars as to what is considered a theatre of war. England was considered to be a theatre of war in the last war, but not in the first war. They say that situation should be cleaned up, and I believe it should. I do not think it would cost a great deal of money.

I would point out that hundreds of thousands of men who served in England during the first war did so because they were ordered to do so. They were in the service to go where they were sent. They performed the duties allocated to them by their officers. Many were technicians, cooks or clerks. When the pay office was set up in London men were kept there. Many vehicle shops were set up and mechanics, machinists and men of that type were kept in England by order of the services. It was not their desire to stay. I know of many in my own unit who were kept there because they had specialized training. Many of them are dead, but some are still living and they think it is rank discrimination to refuse them the benefits of legislation which is applicable to the veteran who served in England during the last war.

I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that when he is going over the legislation for the next parliamentary committee he might sit down and look over this *Hansard* just to provoke his thought. I have no doubt as to

[Mr. Gillis.]

where the parliamentary assistant stands on these matters. I believe that he, along with every member of this house who is a veteran and is free to say what he thinks, thinks exactly the same on these matters as does the veteran who is affected. I know that when the parliamentary assistant takes a look at these matters he will give a hint to those who have the right to make the financial decisions.

Another outstanding grievance has to do with the widows of imperial veterans. It would not cost much money to correct this matter. I use the term "imperial veteran's widow" advisedly because in the presentation to the committee they used the term "allied veteran's widow". I think the term "allied veteran's widow" as applied to the last war would be pretty broad and would take in some strange countries. I believe the wording should be boiled down to "imperial veteran's widow" because in the years gone by when I was doing a lot of talking about this in the Legion it was the imperial veteran's widow we referred to. We were making our demand that the imperial or commonwealth veteran's widow be taken care of.

At the present time if a widow meets the residence qualification and her husband has passed away before completing 20 years' residence in Canada, she is not entitled to the allowance. You may find one widow living next door to another. The one is receiving an allowance because her husband had completed 20 years' residence in the country, while the other receives no allowance because her husband died four days before completing 20 years' residence. It would not cost a lot of money to correct this. Instead of having the qualification that the husband must complete 20 years' residence in the country we should swing it around and say that if the widow completes 20 years' residence in the country she will qualify. That is the only change that is necessary.

I want to leave just one or two more thoughts with the parliamentary assistant. That completed the representations in connection with the war veterans allowance, but the national council of veterans made one or two recommendations to which I think attention should be drawn. These referred to the Pension Act as such.

The first was that consideration should be given to clauses 1 to 11 of the act, which have to do with disability pensioners who may require treatment in a departmental hospital for some disability not related to their pensionable disability. Under the provisions of the act they are obliged to pay for their hospitalization, though at a reduced

rate. They object to having to pay at all, and I agree with them. I suggest that someone should take a look at this.

The second point they made in relation to the Pension Act was in reference to pensioners who go into hospital. Under the act it is the practice to deduct from their pensions \$15 per month, and this has particular application to the pensioner in the higher brackets. I do not need to tell hon. members the physical condition of a 100 per cent pensioner. Many of them are blind, while others have lost both legs. When such a man goes into hospital, while he receives treatment he finds his income, which may consist solely of his 100 per cent pension, reduced by \$15 per month.

On the other hand when a man with a smaller pension goes into hospital he is immediately placed on a 100 per cent pension and in some cases his income while in hospital will be increased by 15, 20 or 50 per cent. The pensioner in the lower brackets does not suffer under that arrangement because he is compensated for the \$15 a month which he loses by the increase in his pension rate brought about by being hospitalized. As I say, the man who is 100 per cent disabled finds his income reduced by \$15 a month while in hospital.

I am not going to make any hard-boiled or firm recommendation on this, because I think there are many angles that require consideration. I would suggest that the next time the interdepartmental committee are taking a look at prospective veterans legislation they consider all these problems so that in the foreseeable future we may be able to finally tie up this act and say that we have done a good job, that we have reached the saturation point. I think there comes a time when you do reach that point, but before we tie it up finally with a little bow of red ribbon the matters I have been discussing this afternoon should receive attention and be ironed out.

I am sorry I have taken up so much time. I think the committee this year was as good as we ever had, but I feel it was a bit restricted because of the terms of reference. I figured that at times it got into a kind of political shemuzzle instead of carrying on as a non-political committee such as it used to be. My final remarks would be to strongly recommend that this committee be made a standing committee of the House of Commons so that when legislation is being contemplated by the government in future the committee could be called together and could sit down and study the legislation and send it back to the government before they decided finally on a bill which might be considered irrevocable.

Mr. Hahn: Mr. Chairman, the consideration of Bill No. 164 by the veterans committee was most enlightening to me, as it was the first time I acted as a member of that committee. I am glad the government has seen fit to introduce this legislation to give further assistance under the war veterans allowance. I was particularly pleased because I had a resolution on the order paper asking that this be done.

In the committee we heard representations from the Canadian Legion, the national council of veterans and the Canadian non-pensioned veterans' widows. I found that those briefs were presented in a most amiable, genial and concise fashion. I would like to congratulate the people who presented the briefs on behalf of those organizations. The departmental officials themselves did not hesitate to give us the answers we asked for, though they were not always the answers for which we hoped. However, they too deserve credit for the frank way in which they responded to our questions.

I was somewhat disappointed in the committee because I had heard so much about the non-partisan way in which it is habitually conducted. I was somewhat taken aback when I found how a particular party voted on a certain portion of the bill. I would very much like to see the committee get back to its original non-partisan nature, and become a committee which recommends legislation that receives the consideration of the government by reason of the fact that it completely expresses the views of the veterans.

I spoke earlier when this legislation was at the resolution stage, and at that time I indicated that I was unhappy with the proposed ceiling levels. The committee did nothing in respect to the representations that were made by the Canadian Legion and the national council, which bodies suggested the ceilings should be higher than those provided in the bill. I find fault with that because it does not take care of certain veterans who are disabled, or who have been thrifty and who stand to lose considerably when this legislation comes into effect. I was very unhappy to see the Liberals as a group vote against the proposed ceilings. Possibly some of the supporters of the government felt as we did, that the proposals we made, despite the terms of reference, should have been included in the recommendations we brought before the house.

There was considerable urgency in respect to the passing of the bill. It was suggested it would come into effect on the first of the month, and therefore it would be effective on the 1st of April. In order to do that it would have to be passed by both chambers, which

made it necessary to have our views expressed in this chamber as quickly as possible. This appears to be the first opportunity to have been made available, with the result that according to the terms of the bill it probably will not come into effect until the 1st of May.

I abhor such an action, though possibly there were reasons for it. I would suggest that the minister make it retroactive to the beginning of this month in order that the veterans will not suffer as a result of this delay. I hope we can pass it today so that if at all possible it can obtain royal assent this afternoon. In any event, I suggest it should be made retroactive.

The bill leaves an undesirable situation in the case of small disability pensioners. It also penalizes the thrifty veterans who have saved during their lifetime or who have a small superannuation, a small annuity or income from some small investment. The small disability pensioners suffer the most because the bill does not make it possible for them to obtain more than the ceiling allowed under its terms.

By way of comparison, the single veterans who are in a position to obtain casual earnings are granted war veterans allowance of \$60 a month. These veterans are permitted casual earnings up to \$50 a month and they may have other income of \$10 a month, if they can prove the need, which gives them a total permissible income of \$1,440 a year. The small disability pensioners, on the other hand, are allowed a disability pension of \$50 a month. Because the ceiling is set at \$840 the maximum war veterans allowance would be \$20 a month. They are penalized to the extent that they are permitted a total maximum allowable income of only \$840 a year.

Married veterans are permitted casual earnings up to \$50 a month and other income of \$12 a month, and obtain \$108 a month under war veterans allowance. The maximum casual earnings would then be \$600 a year. They would have a maximum war veterans allowance of \$1,296 a year and at the rate of \$12 a month they would have a permissible income of \$144, which would give a total income of \$2,040 if the veteran were able to obtain casual earnings to that extent.

A married veteran on a small disability pension may receive \$50 a month in casual earnings which would give him a total of \$600 a year. Because his total permissible income is \$1,440 his maximum war veterans allowance would be only \$840. This group of veterans are penalized because their total permissible income is \$1,440, whereas other

[Mr. Hahn.]

veterans who can obtain casual earnings have a permissible income of \$2,040 a year.

The only way to overcome that condition, I would say, is to make it possible to have these ceilings set at \$2,000 for the married veteran and \$1,200 for the single veteran, as was suggested in the Legion brief. I realize that the small disability pensioner receives \$50 in disability pension, but he has no way of obtaining additional earnings. Therefore he must do with \$1,440 a year what another veteran who is capable of finding and accepting employment can do with his \$2,040 a year. What it actually amounts to is that the single veteran who is eligible for casual earnings and can find a job he is capable of doing is not getting too much, but certainly the man on a small disability pension is getting too little. I earnestly suggest that consideration should be given to that factor. As the hon. member for Cape Breton South said, possibly we should keep that in mind for future legislation, although I would have liked to see it included in the legislation now before us.

Other recommendations were made. I do not intend to deal with each one of them, as did the hon. member for Cape Breton South, in order to indicate my approval or disapproval. As I indicated earlier, the whole brief was well presented and I did not think the veterans were making many unreasonable requests. There may have been one or two things on which I could not quite see eye to eye with them, but in the main their proposals and requests were quite reasonable.

I strongly urge the government to consider the recommendation in respect of widows of imperial war veterans as a matter of some urgency. Some of these veterans who came here 20 odd years ago are no longer living, and their widows do not receive an allowance. I do not see any possible reason for that. If their husband had lived they would receive the allowance, but because they passed away before the 20-year period had elapsed their widows do not receive any allowance. I urge the government to give serious consideration to this matter and see that it is rectified in the very near future.

I also suggest that there should be a permanent committee on veterans affairs. In my opinion a standing committee on veterans affairs is most important. It is apparent that we will have the veterans with us for a long time, and I do not agree with the practice of setting up a special committee at certain times. Last year the committee was not established until the latter part of the session, and I see no excuse for that. If there were no business for the committee to

consider then it would not have to meet, but there should be such a standing committee.

Another matter has been drawn to my attention that I cannot recall seeing in any of the briefs. It has to do with the burial of former recipients of war veterans allowance. The department now buries only veterans whose estates have a value of \$1,000 or less. The department pays \$175 toward a casket and \$30 to open and close a grave, but no provision is made in these cases for a plot. In the city of Vancouver, Mountain View cemetery charges \$95 for a plot and the money is payable in advance. I am thinking more particularly at this time of a widow whose husband was on war veterans allowance and who passed away just a few days ago in Shaughnessy hospital. She finds herself in a very awkward position. She gets \$175 toward the expense of a casket and \$30 to open and close the grave, but she does not get the \$95 with which to buy a plot, and the money for the plot must be paid in advance.

The act is quite stringent. Apparently no allowance is made for a plot. It is a most unfortunate thing that, although we look after the optical needs, care of the teeth and so on of the veteran while he is alive, no allowance is made for a small plot when he dies so that he can be properly placed at rest. In this case the widow did have certain assets of the value of \$280, but they are not immediately realizable. The point of the matter is that she falls within the group of those who have estates left to them of a value of less than \$1,000.

If, on the other hand, this man had died at home the last post fund would have taken care of all the expenses, including the price of the plot. It was her misfortune that her good husband should pass away in the hospital instead of at home. If he had not done so she would not have had any worry. I can understand how upset she would be to receive notice that there is no place for her husband in the veterans' section of the burial ground.

Mr. MacDougall: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak at any length on Bill No. 164. I can go pretty well all the way with the hon. member for Cape Breton South in most of the things he said. I can also go an additional mile starting from scratch with respect to what the hon. member for New Westminster said, but in neither case do they share the great responsibility for this measure that rests upon the government. Sometimes I think it must be a marvellous thing to sit in the seats of the opposition. It may be one of the spots where I shall sit, but until that day arrives I shall be on the government benches.

The situation respecting the objections of the opposition is of course quite clear. They have no responsibility for securing the money. We on the side and this rump side of the house have that responsibility, and we owe it to the people from whom we collect taxes to see that their money is spent in a manner that is at least equitable so far as the general over-all expenditures of the Department of Veterans Affairs are concerned.

I recall, and so will other veterans in the house who were overseas in the first world war, that there were a number of Canadians who did not leave the United Kingdom. As the hon. member for Cape Breton South said, some of them were so ordered, but I think it is also fair to say that some of them were not so ordered.

When we heard evidence in the veterans affairs committee one of the presentations was that of the national council of war veterans, which is composed of five or six different types of men and women who served in various branches of the service and in all probability comprise some 50 per cent of the total membership of the Canadian Legion. They are entirely in disagreement with the Canadian Legion respecting those who served in the United Kingdom in the first world war. They stated when they gave evidence before the committee that at this time they were not prepared to advocate that the veterans of world war I, who served only in the United Kingdom, should come under the influence, if you care to put it that way, of the recipients of war veterans allowance.

As to that I have no fight with the Legion or with the national council of war veterans. But I do say, Mr. Chairman, to all returned men, whether of the last war or of the first war, that there is a great deal of disagreement with respect to this very point. It would seem desirable if and when we consider that question again that there be greater unification of thought either for or against the government introducing that particular legislation.

Certainly I am in agreement with the suggestion that we should have a permanent veterans affairs committee. I can see nothing inimicable in it at all. As the hon. member for New Westminster has said, it now appears as though we are going to have veterans with us for a considerable length of time. I hope that is true.

Mr. Herridge: So do I.

Mr. MacDougall: I hope that is true because the day it ceases to be true I shall not have a voice in this parliament.

When the veterans affairs committee met three years ago I was astounded to learn for

the first time that a 100 per cent pensioner had to pay a certain amount to the hospital while he was hospitalized. I do not know that we can hang too many skeletons on that, because it seems to me that the quintessence of all legislation respecting war veterans is that we are really more concerned about the "have-not" character who has served than we are or ought to be about the one who has a high pension. I have no fight whatever with that, except to say that it does seem a bit discriminatory that the man who served and received disabilities sufficient to put him into the highest disability category, should be penalized that additional \$15 a month when he is hospitalized.

Then again, you could come back if you wished to the real basis of our veterans charter and find there is possibly room for argument on both sides. I think our greatest concern, either as veterans or non-veterans, either as members of this house or non-members, is in assisting the "have-nots" above anyone else. I would not wish particularly to line up on either side of the argument at the moment, but I was surprised to learn that that condition did exist. I did not know it existed until I was a member of the veterans affairs committee three years ago. If anyone wished to do so that could be interpreted as discriminatory legislation.

Before I resume my seat there is one thing I should like to draw to the attention of the committee and the minister. I want to restate a condition which I think needs clarification, and it has nothing to do specifically with the individual pensioner at all, either the disability pensioner or the war veterans allowance recipient. I believe most hon. members are aware of the fact that in Vancouver we have one of the larger military hospitals in Canada, Shaughnessy military hospital. Two or three years ago the superintendent of that hospital sent a recommendation to the Department of Veterans Affairs that the number of personnel in the dispensary of that great institution be increased. Now, by and large the patients who come in from the various parts of the province require medicine, pills, powders and what have you. Many of these patients are hundreds of miles away from Shaughnessy, so they write in to have such and such a prescription number filled. In this dispensing department we have an extremely well trained dispenser who has graduate pharmacists under him. But with this constant influx of mail order prescriptions the time of the chief dispenser is completely utilized in filling them. This results in restricted service from the dispensing department. As I said, the superintendent, a very outstanding man—

[Mr. MacDougall.]

The Chairman: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I am afraid we are getting far afield. This may be partly my own fault, in that I allowed the hon. member for Cape Breton South to speak about treatment. However, I would be obliged to hon. members if they would confine their remarks to the bill which is before us. I feel that we are now a little far afield.

Mr. MacDougall: This matter was brought up when we were discussing the bill in the veterans affairs committee and none of us were called to order. If it is your request that I say nothing more about it, I shall abide by it. My remarks were related to the improvement of facilities for those who are receiving treatment as veterans under the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Chairman: Order. I recall that the hon. member for Cape Breton South prefaced his remarks by saying that the subjects to which he was referring had been mentioned in the committee, and I was hoping he was going to relate his remarks to the bill. I am afraid that certain matters which may have been referred to in the committee should not be referred to here, because we are dealing with the bill itself.

Mr. MacDougall: I shall bow to your authority, gladly and willingly. I shall, therefore, bring my remarks to a rapid conclusion.

The bill, by and large, as it comes before the house from the committee, not only in my opinion but in the opinion of a great number of the recipients of war veterans allowance in British Columbia, is a much better bill than a lot of them had suspected they would get. It is generally recognized that in British Columbia we have 28 to 30 per cent of the total recipients of war veterans allowance in Canada.

As a representative from British Columbia I am sure the large part of the population of that province who are recipients of war veterans allowances will be pleased with this bill in its present form. When I say this I am not suggesting that the bill contains everything that one might expect to find ultimately in legislation which may come up later. But, as of this moment, I am quite sure the bill will receive the hearty endorsement of war veterans in Canada generally, and particularly those in British Columbia, and that it will be recognized as a great advance over what we had last year and in preceding years.

Mr. White (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak only briefly, and to concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Royal and other hon. members of the opposition groups who have spoken. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has

said the responsibility is that of the government, but I do not altogether agree with him. The fact is that the great majority of members who have served on veterans affairs committees have been veterans who have actually seen war service, men who understood and appreciated the debt Canada owes to the veterans, particularly those of world war I.

It is true that the government must find the money to meet any increase in the allowances. I do feel, however, that the citizens of Canada will never object to any grant or allowance or pension paid by the country to Canadians who served so well in two world wars. The hon. member who just took his seat also referred to what appears in the brief with reference to service in England in world war I. I was not exactly clear as to what he said, but I would point out that at page 8 of the Legion's brief they make this recommendation:

That veterans of world war I who saw service in England only be granted war veterans allowance.

That is certainly plain enough. It is clear from this recommendation that the Legion wishes to have those veterans who served only in England made eligible for the allowance. The comment in the brief is as follows:

The veterans of world war II who served in England only are eligible for war veterans allowance, and many who served in the same theatre during world war I suffered equal if not greater hardship.

It has been pointed out by other speakers, and I am sure the parliamentary assistant and the government will realize, that the number of veterans of world war I who would receive this allowance would be very small indeed at this date, and that each year the number is decreasing. I would hope the parliamentary assistant and members of the government would give earnest consideration to including these veterans in the bill.

Many hon. members have made reference to the brief presented by the Legion, and have commented at some length on the moderate and reasonable nature of the recommendations made therein. Of the briefs I have heard presented by the Legion to various committees I think that presented this year was not only one of the shortest, but the requests made therein were the most modest. It is difficult for any hon. member, particularly one who has seen service in a theatre of war, to say that the minimum asked by the Legion of \$60 for a single man and \$120 for a married man, as well as a ceiling of \$1,200 for a single and \$2,000 for a married man, is either excessive or unreasonable. They have pointed out the amount of the deductions allowed under the

Income Tax Act. They have also pointed out that the recipient of a war veterans allowance is one of the few citizens in Canada who is discriminated against in the matter of the old age pension. Hon. members know that when a war veteran reaches the age of 70 he will receive the pension of \$40, and that at such time his war veterans allowance cheques are decreased accordingly.

Speaking briefly when the bill was before the house previously I pointed out that one of my reasons for believing the ceiling should be increased was that it would encourage the veteran to earn as much as possible, so he would not have continuously hanging over his head this threat, if it may be so described, of having his allowance decreased in the event of going over the ceiling. The parliamentary assistant may make reference to casual earnings. It must be realized, however, that because of the areas in which they reside, the opportunities of many veterans to earn casual earnings are very limited indeed.

I was disappointed when the bill was before the committee to find that there was no opportunity to make any change in its terms. In committee I moved this amendment:

That the committee recommend that the government give consideration to introducing legislation during the present session of parliament which will have the effect of providing for amendments to this bill that will substitute \$1,200 for \$840 in section 1, column 3 of schedule A, and \$120 for \$108 in sections 2 and 3 of column 2 in schedule A, and \$2,000 for \$1,440 in sections 2 and 3, column 3 of schedule A.

My amendment was in line with the recommendations made by the Canadian Legion, and it had the support of all opposition members on the committee. As it turned out, the motion was defeated; and it was pointed out to me that if I insisted upon the amendment it might have the effect of killing Bill No. 164, so that the veterans would lose the benefits contained therein. If that was correct then it seems to me there was little purpose in having the committee, and very little to be gained by having the Legion or other veterans organizations appearing before it to make recommendations.

I would hope that at some time in the future amendments would be adopted to bring the legislation in line with the recommendations made by the Legion. I would point out, however, that the War Veterans Allowance Act is not amended every year, or every two years, and I fear that we might have to wait a very long time before amendments could be brought in whereby the allowances would be increased and the ceilings raised.

The bill provides that, if it receives royal assent today, the measure will take effect tomorrow, April 1. As this winter has been exceptionally severe, because of the cold weather and the great amount of snow; because heavier expenditures for fuel, clothing and food have been necessary, and because jobs for war veterans allowance recipients have been very much restricted, I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that this is one occasion when the government should consent to having the bill made retroactive to January 1, 1955. If that were done I am sure it would have the hearty support not only of all hon. members but of all citizens of Canada. There have been other occasions in this house when benefits have been conferred in income tax legislation, in the budget and in various other ways. They have been made retroactive to the first of the year. I would most earnestly recommend to the parliamentary assistant, even at this late date, that when we come to the last clause of the bill he move an amendment providing that the act come into force and have effect as from January 1, 1955.

Mr. Herridge: I am going to make only a few brief comments on this bill, because I know a number of hon. members wish to speak this afternoon and perhaps this evening. All hon. members want to see the bill receive royal assent today. I must first of all say that I support the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Royal, the hon. member for Cape Breton South and other hon. members who have spoken on the government's failure to accept the proposals of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans. The special parliamentary committee on veterans affairs has had the opportunity to study and discuss this bill, and also to obtain some very valuable and important information from the officials of the department. The deputy minister of the department, the chairman of the war veterans allowance board, the director general of rehabilitation services and others gave to the committee some very valuable information, which can only really be obtained satisfactorily in committee as the result of questioning. The committee heard representations from the Canadian Legion, the national council of veterans and the non-pensioned veterans' widows organization. With regard to the non-pensioned veterans' widows, I was particularly interested to note that our new parliamentary assistant has made a special study of widows' problems. That was evident in the proceedings of the committee, and his promptness in answering all questions that arose with respect to the needs of widows and their problems.

[Mr. White (Hastings-Frontenac).]

These ladies come before the committee whenever it is established and make their representations. I think hon. members will recognize the fact that, because of their broad experience and association, they have brought matters to the attention of the committee which might not have been brought to its notice if they had not formed themselves into an organization and come to Ottawa to make those representations. I notice that when one of the representatives of this organization was giving evidence before the committee she said that she would love it—that was the term she used—if the parliamentary assistant would visit their organization and explain the act and the regulations whenever required.

In view of the special study the parliamentary assistant has made of this problem—and I might say it is apparent that this is another evolution in the development of the department and its specialized activities which I think is most necessary—I am writing to the persons connected with these organizations of widows receiving war veterans allowances and advising them to write the parliamentary assistant and send to him their problems; to come to Ottawa, if necessary, and when they come to Ottawa to see him. If they are unable to come to Ottawa I tell them to be certain to write and ask him to attend their meetings and explain the act and regulations to them. I am quite confident, Mr. Chairman, that our parliamentary assistant will be only too willing at all times to give these ladies the benefit of his extensive knowledge, understanding and appreciation.

We of this group regret very much that the government has not seen fit to accept in full the proposals of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans. I think it is quite fair to say that they are gratified with the improvements in the act and the benefits this bill will bring. In that respect the editor of *The Legionary* set it out very clearly in the last issue. He said:

While grateful for the improvements contained in the bill,—

And we are all grateful for these improvements.

—the Canadian Legion will be presenting a brief to the parliamentary committee in which the above points will be emphasized.

He is referring to an increase to \$120 for married veterans and an increase in the permissive income. The article continues:

It can only be hoped that the committee, always composed of members of parliament who are ex-servicemen themselves, will be able to influence the government to go the whole way in its sympathetic treatment of these old veterans.

The committee was not able to persuade a majority of its members to recommend to the government amendments in line with the hopes of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans. While it is to be regretted that the government has not seen fit to raise the married veterans' income to \$120 a month, yet one of the most unfortunate things about the present bill is the failure to raise the permissive income as suggested by the veterans organization.

That occasions particular hardship to three groups of veterans in receipt of war veterans allowance. The first group consists of those who have no other income and are unable to earn. They are sadly in need of an increase in the allowance, particularly the married veterans. The second group consists of veterans receiving a small disability pension without the ability to earn casual earnings. The third group consists of those who have a small regular income, such as an annuity or an industrial pension, or something of that sort, and who are also unable to earn.

These three groups suffer severely from the fact that the government has not agreed to raise the allowance for married veterans to \$120, and to raise the ceiling on permissive income. When the minister was speaking some time ago, at the resolution stage, or when the bill was introduced, he referred to the cost to the country of meeting the proposals of the veterans organizations in full. It is quite right that he should think the cost should be considered. All hon. members recognize that we have a responsibility to Canada as a whole, to all the citizens of Canada. I do not think any one of us should act irresponsibly in that respect. We have to consider the cost of this legislation to the people of Canada as a whole.

In view of the cost of meeting the proposals of the veterans organizations we are fully warranted in accepting our responsibility to the veterans concerned, in introducing legislation which will meet the proposals of those organizations. In this connection, we have been spending in recent years an average of \$2 billion on defence. According to this year's estimates the cost of defence will be reduced by about \$133 million. When the minister spoke he informed the house that to give effect to the proposals of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans would cost the country an additional \$24,750,000. That is only about one-fifth of what we are spending on national defence this year. Surely when we have the opportunity to save \$133 million this year on national defence we would be acting in a responsible manner if we took \$24,750,000 of that saving

and applied it to meet the needs of the veterans who have fought for this country.

The minister informs us that to give effect to the proposals contained in this bill will cost about \$9.5 million. In addition to the fact that we would be able to meet the representations of the veterans organizations with only a fraction of the saving on defence, in the opinion of members of this group this type of legislation simply represents a redistribution of wealth which is most necessary in Canada at this time if we are going to maintain prosperity and improve our social democracy. The putting into effect of this legislation would introduce into the purchasing power stream about \$800,000 a month. That would be of considerable assistance throughout the whole country. As I say, we look upon this type of legislation as a form of transfer payment, as providing an opportunity to transfer wealth from those who have it to those who do not, in order that they may have some opportunity to maintain a satisfactory standard of living.

According to newspaper reports and rumour in general, which sometimes has some foundation, when the budget is introduced it will provide for some reduction in corporation taxes. I want to say to the parliamentary assistant that if that proves to be true, if the government of this country which has been able to save \$133 million this year on national defence should reduce corporation taxes—any reduction would run into quite a number of millions—without granting the veterans the legislation proposed by their organizations, then it will have demonstrated that it is willing to give more consideration to the representations of large corporations in Canada than to those of veterans organizations with respect to legislation necessary for the veterans of this country.

However, I am always somewhat of an optimist. The committee has not presented its final report, and I do hope that as a result of the discussion in the committee and the bombardment from the opposition side of the chamber during the discussion of this bill it will recommend to the government a further consideration of the proposals of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans so that in the near future we may have an opportunity of discussing legislation which will be satisfactory to all hon. members of this house, which will be approved by the veterans organizations and which will meet the needs of veterans across this country who require our urgent consideration at this time.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, realizing the desirability of completing the discussion of

this bill as quickly as possible, I do not propose to take very long. However there are several observations I want to make in connection with this legislation. It is my privilege to represent all the residents of the Fraser Valley constituency, among whom will be found a great many war veterans. I think I would be remiss in my duty if I allowed this opportunity to pass without expressing to the department and the government their appreciation for the measures which have been brought forward to improve the conditions of those receiving war veterans allowances.

Having voiced that appreciation I should like to say that the general reaction to the minister's announcement with respect to war veterans allowances has been just what was expected. In the first place there has been appreciation, but coupled with that there has been an expression of disappointment and resentment over the fact that the government has not seen fit to go all the way in meeting the requests of the various veterans organizations.

Speaking during the debate on the throne speech I referred to the proposed legislation and stated that anything less than full compliance with the Legion brief would not be satisfactory to the Legion branches. At this time I should like to refer to a number of communications which I have received in this connection. I shall give their source only, except that I shall read two brief telegrams.

I have received telegrams from T. W. Krell, president of the Maple Ridge branch No. 88, Canadian Legion, at Haney, B.C. There is another telegram from C. E. Gummerson, secretary of the Chilliwack branch 4, Canadian Legion. There is one from D. MacLennan, secretary of the British Columbia Command, Canadian Legion; one from B. W. Harris, Fraser Valley zone commander, Canadian Legion, and finally one from Mr. C. J. Inkman, president of the Agassiz branch, Canadian Legion. As I have said already I shall read only two of these. The first one from D. MacLennan, provincial secretary of the British Columbia command, reads:

The Canadian Legion in British Columbia considers proposed increases in war veterans allowance rates and permissible income inadequate and therefore request your earnest support in committee and on the floor of the house for what we consider minimum adequate increases as requested in brief presented by our dominion council.

The other telegram I wish to read is from B. W. Harris, Fraser Valley zone commander of the Canadian Legion. This reads:

Two thousand members of Canadian Legion in Fraser valley zone deplore limited increase of war veterans allowance and demand the government implement the legion brief in its entirety. Your full support in this vital matter respectfully requested. We are tired of accepting the fragments.

[Mr. Patterson.]

I believe it was the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard who stated that those in the Legion generally felt that they had received more than they anticipated. According to these telegrams that would hardly seem to be so, because they voice their dissatisfaction most definitely and clearly. We had hoped that some of the remaining inadequacies in the veterans legislation would be dealt with by committee recommendation, but there have been no appreciable changes.

There are two or three matters I should like to mention, only briefly, because they have been referred to already by other speakers. A clarification of the casual earnings provision is most important, and further publicity should be given to this provision. There are many members of the Legion and a great many veterans who are not cognizant of the privileges they are entitled to under this particular clause. Therefore I think as much publicity as possible should be given to this provision.

On looking over this legislation it would seem to me that the neglected group is the one made up of war veterans allowance recipients who are without the means of supplementing their income. They are those who are physically unable to accept work to supplement their income even under the casual earnings clause. Therefore we find that this particular group are having a difficult time making ends meet, and certainly they are not receiving sufficient income to live in any degree of comfort whatsoever.

The other group in this same category, of course, are those who are unable to secure suitable employment. There are quite a number of veterans in this class referred to in the various briefs which were presented and in the replies to questions given by the witnesses. Surely some way can be found to give additional assistance to these veterans.

I might just say that one of the matters which has been drawn to my attention is the fact that in British Columbia some former enemies are receiving more under the old age pension that is received by veterans under war veterans allowances. This does not contribute to the happiness of veterans who served in theatres of war. I believe some further consideration should be given to this particular matter.

The second recommendation in the brief presented by Mr. A. J. Wickens, president of the army, navy and air force veterans in Canada, which has been called to our attention this afternoon, reads as follows:

That the practice of deducting \$15 per month from the allowance payable to a disability pensioner, when he goes into a Department of Veterans Affairs hospital for treatment of a disability which has occurred as a result of active service be eliminated.

I trust that this matter will be taken under advisement and that close attention will be given to it as soon as possible.

I had the opportunity of discussing veterans affairs with representatives of veterans groups in the Fraser Valley just a short time before I came down to this session, and there were several matters which they brought to my attention. One of these is the situation in which the veterans of the first world war find themselves, those who did not serve in theatres of war, so classed, but who served only in England. I was not previously aware of the fact that during the first world war Canadian troops were bombed in England and suffered casualties. There does not appear to be any justifiable reason for excluding such veterans from the benefits of the war veterans allowance.

The question of the standing committee has again been referred to this afternoon, and the Legion groups in my area are very desirous that this matter be given consideration and that a committee be set up. There are other subjects to which I could refer, but they are outside the terms of this bill so we must leave them for a future occasion. However, we do appeal to the government and to the department to fill in some of the gaps which still remain in the veterans legislation, and remedy some of the remaining inadequacies so that assistance will be given to the veterans in all cases adequate for their needs and commensurate with the feelings of a grateful nation.

Mr. Henderson: As a veteran and a member of the veterans affairs committee I would like to say a few complimentary words about this bill and also about those who are responsible for the administration of veterans affairs in this country.

I might say in the first place we should be extremely proud of the veterans of Canada. We as Canadians were proud of them as soldiers and are still proud of them as veterans, and we cannot measure in dollars and cents the gratitude and assistance which should be given to unfortunate veterans in need.

I agree with the hon. member for Kootenay West that on behalf of the people of Canada we still have to consider the cost; but I would like to congratulate this department upon the advances they have made in this bill in keeping abreast with the needs of our veterans. It is very easy to say "too little and too late"; nevertheless I think great progress has been made in this committee, and I would not want any impression left that the committee members were working against each other. As a member of the veterans affairs committee since I have been in this

house I have always found that veterans from all parties strive toward a common end, and that is to the benefit of the veterans. It brings a great feeling of satisfaction to belong to a group of veterans in Canada who endeavour to play their part and give assistance to the other veterans. I think it has been a good committee composed of good people.

We in Canada have advanced veterans legislation when we compare it to veterans legislation in various countries throughout the world. I think this can be attributed to all governments since world war I, and to the fact that we have been fortunate in having the very best men serve as ministers of veterans affairs. We were most fortunate in the predecessor to the present minister, and I congratulate the present minister and his parliamentary assistant on the work they have done in bringing about this present bill.

In closing I would like to say these few words. Since I have been a member of parliament I have always found those in the Department of Veterans Affairs anxious to do everything they could to assist the veterans and endeavour to ensure that they received their just rights. All I can say in conclusion is that I hope they keep up this good work.

Mr. Lennard: Mr. Chairman, as one who has been interested and active in veterans affairs since 1919, and who has served on various veterans affairs committees in this house since 1935, with the exception of the last two committees, I feel obliged to take up the time of the house for a few moments this afternoon.

In connection with this bill I must say that I am thoroughly in accord with what has been said by the hon. member for Royal, the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac and the other members of the opposition who have spoken. In that connection I suspect that those who have spoken and probably all members of this house have received many letters and communications relating to these matters, but they have refrained from taking up the time of the house to put them on the record.

In the matter of veterans affairs generally I have always felt the policy of this government has been one of delayed action. Over the years the government has appointed veterans affairs committees, possibly one every two or three years, and occasionally the appointment of the committee would coincide with a meeting of the British Empire Service League in Canada. The government have always rushed things through because they had to have them finalized before the national meeting, and there was a great

hullabaloo raised at these meetings that we had done so much for the veterans; but as far as the veterans of the first great war are concerned I do think they are receiving too little too late. In that connection may I say that the pattern on this occasion is the same. This measure was brought into the house a couple of weeks ago, rushed to the veterans affairs committee, came back to the house just yesterday, and is being discussed now on the last day of the fiscal year. We are told now that if it does not pass and receive royal assent today the benefits will be delayed. That has always been the case with respect to veterans affairs since I have been a member of the House of Commons. I am not critical of some of the legislation that has been brought forward but I do feel that it has been the practice of the government not to do anything until the last minute so that they may save a dollar some place. I have always regretted that. Finally, may I repeat that the veterans of the first great war are getting too little, too late.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, the bill to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act has come back to the house from the special committee on veterans affairs with only one minor amendment, an amendment which was suggested by the departmental solicitor and which does not bring any direct benefit to the veterans at all. In so far as any amendments which would go further than the original bill to meet the request of the veterans organizations are concerned, there simply is no such animal. Today we are discussing in effect the bill in the same form as it was when it went to the committee.

The reason why there is no amendment is that the solid Liberal phalanx in the committee stood behind the government and refused to have any amendment made. They voted down any suggestion that the government should even give consideration to further changes to help the veterans. In this committee, as distinct from the last two veterans affairs committees, there has not even been a recommendation brought forward to the house that consideration should be given by the government to something better.

I think the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard put his finger on one of the reasons for this attitude of government members in the committee when he said this afternoon that on the government side they have a great responsibility so far as legislation is concerned. He should have said they have a great responsibility to the Liberal party. That has been the basis on which the veterans affairs committee of the present session of parliament has functioned. It seems to be the thought among government

[Mr. Lennard.]

members on the committee that they have done their duty by the veterans of Canada if they have protested quietly, secretly, and anywhere else but in the house or in the committee, to the Minister of Veterans Affairs or his parliamentary assistant. Of course that strikes at the very roots of parliamentary government. The place for them to protest is right here on the floor of the house. If they are not satisfied with the legislation brought down and feel it should be improved, their protest should be made on the floor of the house and not to a minister behind some closed door. As long as that is the only type of protesting done by government members about these veterans bills, the veterans of Canada are never likely to see the legislation passed to which they are so justly entitled.

The objectionable features about this measure still remain. They are that the allowance to the married veteran remains at \$108 per month instead of having been raised to \$120, that the permissive income for a single veteran, over and above the allowance, is still only \$10 a month, what it was before the bill was introduced, and that the permissive income of a married veteran is only \$12 a month, just \$2 more than it was before the amending bill was introduced.

A hon. members know, recommendations were made by two thoroughly responsible and statesmanlike bodies of veterans. I refer to the Canadian Legion and the National Council. They recommended that married veterans should be paid an allowance of \$120 per month, that the permissive income over the allowance should be \$40 in the case of the single veteran, which would have enabled him to receive \$100 per month in all, and that the permissive income of the married veteran should be raised so that he could receive a total of \$2,000 per year.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard say this afternoon that his and my province of British Columbia, which has the largest percentage of war veterans allowance recipients of any province in Canada, would give hearty endorsement to the amendments as set out in the bill. I do not know where he got that idea because I have a wire here from Mount Pleasant branch No. 177 of the Legion in his own riding. It reads as follows:

The Mount Pleasant branch 177 Canadian Legion has ordered a night letter to be sent to you asking for your continued support on behalf of the recipients of war veterans allowance as presented by the Canadian Legion dominion command convention. The Vancouver zone council has set up a committee for the purpose of dealing with this matter and to arouse public opinion and support for this cause. The Legion request as

outlined is reasonable and should receive the full support of the members of parliament on the government side of the house.

It has not had support from one member on the government side of the house. The wire continues:

We the members of the Legion are sure the other members of parliament will support the Legion program.

They are right in that, because all opposition parties have supported the Legion program. Then I had a wire from the provincial secretary of the whole British Columbia and northwest states command which reads as follows:

The Canadian Legion in British Columbia considers proposed increases in war veterans allowance rates and permissible income inadequate and therefore request your earnest support in committee and on the floor of the house for what we consider minimum adequate increases as requested in brief presented by our dominion council.

That command went further. They advertised in all the daily papers of British Columbia. I have here the advertisement taken from the *Vancouver Province* of March 15. It reads:

Canadian Legion

British Columbia and N.W. States Command
We strongly protest the federal government's proposed increase to War Veterans Allowance Act as being inadequate. We consider our request, originally made three years ago, as the minimum which will be acceptable to improve the lot of our veterans.

Below they published the telegram, a copy of which I have read. I endorse the recommendations made by the Legion and the National Council and I propose to say a few words in support of those recommendations. First of all, I will deal with the recommendation that the allowance for a married veteran should be increased to \$120 a month. As I pointed out, the bill only increases it to \$108. This question was dealt with in the committee, and dealt with very adequately by Major A. J. Wickens, an outstanding veteran of Canada, who is the president of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada. He had this to say about this recommendation, and it is found at page 28 of the proceedings of the committee:

I do feel, as our brief says, that it costs a war veterans allowance recipient just as much to maintain a wife as it does to maintain himself, and we feel that a wife of one of these veterans is entitled to live at the same standard as her husband is, and we do not feel that because a man has taken unto himself a wife, as he is entitled to, that he should either require the wife to live at two-thirds of the standard he is authorized to live at, or that he should average his income out, and thus reduce his own standard. I do not think there is much more which can be said about that. It is fairly evident that the cost of maintaining a war veterans allowance recipient's wife should at least be fixed at an

equal level. If that is accepted the total for a married couple would be \$120 a month, and if any gentleman in this room can show me how my wife and I can live in decency and moderate comfort on that sum, I would be very grateful to him for dealing with the question, because that information would be invaluable.

The war veterans allowance, as it was contained in the veterans charter, originally did provide a married veteran should have twice as much as a single veteran. This percentage has been changed only in recent years.

Then, I turn to the question of permissive income over the allowance or, in other words, the ceiling on the money a recipient can receive. The provision under this bill is for \$10 per month for a single man and \$12 for a married man. Everything that was heard in the committee clearly pointed to the crying need for an increase in the ceiling. This was the one way in which the need of this group of veterans could have been met adequately.

Let us consider, for example, a veteran or widow who has reached 70 years of age. One would think, and I do not doubt that most Canadians think, when a war veterans allowance recipient reaches 70 years of age, he or she automatically gets an additional \$40 per month, just as all other Canadians do. Well, that is not the case. Instead, every veteran who happens to be a small pensioner or on a superannuation or to have a small income obtained from some other source up to \$10 per month, if he is single, or \$12 per month if he is married, will get nothing additional whatever when he reaches 70 years of age. If he has not any other such outside income, then he can only benefit to the extent of \$10 per month if he is single or \$12 per month if he is married when he reaches 70 years of age.

The national council dealt with this very clearly in their brief, and I quote from page 3, recommendation No. 3:

That the recipients of war veterans allowance, upon qualifying for old age security, should receive the old age security, without reductions in the W.V.A., except in so far as the total income exceeds the total allowable income under the W.V.A. Act.

As recommended by them, it would have been \$1,200 a year for a single veteran and \$2,000 a year for a married veteran.

The comment contained in the brief on this recommendation reads as follows:

Increasing age is generally attended by gradual reducing possibilities of supplementing allowance through causal earning. Therefore, the aging recipient of war veterans allowance who may have been able through his efforts to supplement and enjoy a few comforts will under the proposed provisions of this act be reduced to the subsistence level of the war veterans allowance recipient who has never been able to supplement.

The individual who has never been able to supplement has undoubtedly suffered hardships to which he may have become more or less reconciled. The individual who is forced to reduce his living standard by reason of age and more completely disabling physical capacities, experiences discouragement amounting to tragedy. It would seem only humane to permit the W.V.A. recipient to enjoy the old age security allowance, coupled with sufficient war veterans allowance to the total of permissible income from all sources.

I point out that there is a source from which this additional \$40 can come, and that is from the old age security fund. The old age security payment is not supposed to be a handout at all. Government supporters have taken the position, and spoken on platforms all over the country, to the effect that the old age security is something towards which we contribute. In other words, the people have paid for it and are entitled to it as of right. The veteran has paid for it too. He has paid the 2 per cent sales tax just the same as you and I have paid it. He may have paid a 2 per cent income tax, and he is entitled to the benefits of the 2 per cent corporation tax which is devoted to building up this old age security fund. This is not the case of a handout. This old age security fund is contributory and the veteran should be entitled to get the full \$40 per month when he reaches the age of 70.

Really, the question of the man over 70 or the widow over 70 is the real basis for this whole problem. The average age today of all recipients is between 65 and 70. It will only be a matter of a few years until practically everybody now on war veterans allowance is over 70 years of age, and that applies to both veterans and widows. I refer hon. members to the table 3 on page 76 of the proceedings of the committee. This table shows the age groups of the recipients of war veterans allowances. There were 44,794 veterans and widows getting war veterans allowance at the end of 1954. Of that number, 11,836 veterans and 3,706 widows were 70 years of age and over. This group totalled 15,542, which is over one-third of the total number drawing allowances at the present time. Then, in the next group from 65 to 70, many of whom will be 70 in the next year, there was another 11,521. Within five years, therefore, you will have well over half of the war veterans allowance recipients over the age of 70.

Those who have reached that age cannot benefit from the war veterans allowance assistance fund because they would get a small amount of the old age security if they did not have any other income. We are told there are only 193 who are 70 years of age

[Mr. Green.]

or over, and who are able to come under what is called section 4 which enables a veteran to take a job for a period of say two months or six months. Practically none of them have been able to qualify under that section. I am sure there are just a handful who are able to get casual earnings in this group over 70 years of age. These people can only be given fair treatment by raising the ceiling, and they should be allowed to get the additional \$40 per month.

Another group to consider is the small pensioners, people on small pensions, and some of the ex-employees of the Canadian National Railways who are on small superannuation payments, or civil servants in a similar position—and I am referring to both veterans and widows. Some of these are over 70 years, and the remarks I have made apply to them.

But, taking those under 70 years; here again is a source from which money could come. They are on pension or on superannuation. They cannot benefit from the war veterans allowance assistance fund, because they have these small pensions or small superannuation. They are trapped by the low ceilings. In the case of a pensioner, it really means that that pensioner is penalized for his wound. He is penalized because he was wounded. And in the case of a man who has been thrifty and has put by some savings, no doubt he is penalized by reason of his thrift—and all because the ceiling on permissive income is too low.

According to the figures given to us in the committee there were 28,612 veterans and widows under 70, including the small pensioners or those who happened to have superannuation. Out of that 28,612 there were 20,648 who had no accountable income—no income whatsoever. One might think that they could benefit from the assistance fund up to the extent of the ceiling, which in the case of a single veteran is \$10, and in the case of a married veteran \$12. But the regulations with regard to the assistance fund are pretty strict. First of all, there must be a second means test. The veteran or the widow of a veteran must be grilled about his or her assets, and all that sort of thing, and go through this second means test.

The regulation dated October 6, 1954, P.C. 1954-1538 states in paragraph No. 7:

A recipient under the War Veterans Allowance Act, 1952, whose income is less than that shown in column III of schedule A or B to that act, as the case may be, may be granted on application assistance by the district committee to the maximum allowed by the provisions of the act relating to income—

That is, he could be granted up to the ceiling of permissive income.

Provided—

And here is what does the damage.

Provided that, in the opinion of the district committee, such recipient requires financial assistance to relieve distress.

And the result, as it is shown in the table appearing at page 77, is that there are only 3,757 veterans and 1,531 widows, or a total of 5,288 out of the 20,648 who have no other income, who have been able to qualify for the war veterans allowance assistance fund.

The department says: Well, that is because they did not apply. In other words, the implication is that 15,000 of these veterans and widows did not apply for assistance under the war veterans allowance assistance fund. In this same table however we find how much was paid to them in a period of ten months last year. There was a total of \$393,533.71, and that works out at \$74.42 each for that ten-month period or \$7.44 a month. So that they were not getting even the \$10 allowed under the act.

If the ceiling on permissive income were increased, then more of these veterans and widows could benefit from the assistance fund, and those who are on the fund could benefit more than they do at the present time. But the whole story is that the ceiling is too low. Everyone who served on the committee knows this to be the fact. I do not believe there is a member in the house who will rise in this debate and say he believes the ceiling on permissive income is not too low. We were given a good example of this by Mr. A. E. Lanning of the Canadian Corps Association when, at page 34 of the evidence before the committee he said:

The means test is another thing with which we are concerned. Not long ago, on Bay street, I heard one of our wealthy friends quipping facetiously that he was buying a big new car. His friend said, "You are going to get only about 14 miles to the gallon with that." He said, "Yes, but my birthday is in February and I am going on the old age pension; and I figure that the government can pay for the gas for the new car."

This, by the way, was not a veteran speaking. Mr. Lanning continues:

That is all very well, but the veteran on war veterans allowance is not going to be able to buy a big car and run his car on gas paid for by an allowance without a means test. So we think that the means test is a little harsh on war veterans, and every opportunity should be given to the older man who is ambitious enough to go out and do something. You set a ceiling of \$10 a month, but you have to pay a boy \$10 a month to come and cut your grass. What is a man going to do to keep his earnings down to \$10? It is a ridiculous figure.

That sums up the whole argument: it is a ridiculous figure. I say that \$10 for a single veteran and \$12 for a married veteran is ridiculous.

The Legion dealt with this matter, too, because at page 5 of their brief we find this:

The War Veterans' Allowance Act recognizes that the ceiling is too low, and under section 4—

The one to which I referred, which enables a man to work for a period of a few months—and the regulations governing causal earnings, permit it to be substantially exceeded. Yet for those unable to avail themselves of these provisions no exceptions are permitted.

And there is not the slightest doubt that only a handful are able to avail themselves of those provisions.

Section 4 and the provisions governing causal earnings also recognize the desirability of self-help, but this recognition is not extended to those who by forethought and thrift have gained for themselves small pensions or retirement annuities. The great merit of our Old Age Security Act is that it recognizes the desirability of encouraging individual thrift and saving, but the War Veterans' Allowance Act discourages it.

Our pension laws recognize that pensions for disabilities cannot be affected by the earnings of the individual, but the small pensioner who must also use War Veterans' Allowance, finds his pension of little value because its amount is practically deducted from his allowance.

These and other anomalies would be largely eliminated if the ceiling on permissive income were increased to \$1,200 and \$2,000.

It is a tragedy that these ceilings are not being raised at this session, as requested by these veterans organizations. But the question will have to be faced; it is not going to be allowed to die down. These men and widows are entitled to a raising of the ceiling. Practically all the men were front-line soldiers, most of whom served this nation in the front-line trenches in Europe in the first war. Practically all were volunteers; and I believe the failure of the government to raise this ceiling at this session by an adequate amount means shabby and ungrateful treatment of these veterans of Canada.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to unduly delay the passage of the legislation; but I believe that if by this action the opposition groups were able to convince the government of the necessity of amending the bill to provide for the recommendations made by veterans organizations, such a delay would be publicly approved. It is highly improbable that that could be done, since the opposition groups were unable to convince the government members of the veterans affairs committee who without exception are veterans. We were unable to convince those who have a complete understanding of the position and the need of the

burned out pensioners of the desirability of those changes so it is very optimistic to suppose that we can convince the government.

I certainly share the view of the opposition members who have spoken on this bill. As has been pointed out, this legislation could be described as too little and too late. The need of those recipients of war veterans allowance existed 5 years ago in the same way as it exists today. Legislation should have been introduced at that time to provide relief for those in need. If the principle of providing assistance is desirable today, it was equally desirable many years ago.

I know that those who will receive the increase in the allowance will appreciate it. But I share the view of the other members that two significant factors were overlooked. The permissive income was not increased sufficiently and the allowance for the married veteran was not increased to the desired proportion.

When negotiations take place it is the practice of those making their request to ask for more than they hope to achieve. However, in the case of the veterans organizations, I am convinced that this is not so. I do not think anyone can accuse the Canadian Legion of asking for more than they realized was required by the veterans of Canada. It is most unfortunate that the recommendations of hundreds of thousands of veterans, through their organizations, were ignored by the federal government. I would request the government at this stage to reconsider the recommendations of the veterans organizations and increase the permissive income to \$1,200 and \$2,000, and to increase the allowance for the married recipients from \$108 to \$120. That is the least we can do at this time.

Not too many days ago we completed the debate on unemployment and it was generally agreed that it was a serious problem to have 614,000 unemployed in Canada. That has a very close association with the topic under discussion, because a lot of emphasis has been placed on the fact that a veteran is able to augment his income with casual earnings. It has always been difficult for a man getting on in years to get those odd jobs. It is more difficult for war-worn men to compete with 614,000 unemployed in seeking little jobs to augment their income.

I am pressing the point that it is necessary to increase the permissive income so that if a man has a permanent job which does not pay very much, but is still a permanent job, or has wisely invested his money in a pension fund he will be permitted to receive the maximum benefits and not have to expect

[Mr. Johnson (Kindersley).]

to augment it in competition with the younger unemployed men through casual earnings.

One of the methods that the government has used and relied on to ease unemployment is the transfer payments, family allowances, old age pensions and unemployment insurance. Surely, to increase the war veterans allowance payments of the married veteran to \$120 as well as increasing the permissive income would be one way of transferring payments, because the veteran would not be able to save that small amount of money. He would have to put it back in circulation in order to live.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am expressing the view of the Legion bodies and the veterans in my own constituency, as well as those in the rest of Canada, when I make a strong appeal to the government to take the protests of the opposition groups in this house into consideration and make the desired changes as recommended by the veterans' organizations.

Mr. Quelch: I appreciate the fact that in Canada we have a very fine program of veterans legislation. However, for a number of years the main weakness in that program has been the War Veterans Allowance Act. Let me hasten to add that when I say that I am not for one minute criticizing the officials who administer that department. So far as they are concerned, they are doing an exceptionally good job in leaning over backwards in looking after the interests of the veterans, but they are limited in their actions by the legislation.

At the second reading stage, I congratulated the government on increasing the amount of the allowance, but I deplored the fact that they had not seen fit to increase the ceiling. Unfortunately, the committee did not see fit to make any recommendations in that regard at this time. I hope the Liberal members of the committee will not be offended when I say that the new Liberal members of the committee, the members of the Liberal party who have been appointed to the committee during the last ten years, are a little hesitant today about making any recommendations, or supporting any recommendations, that will go beyond the government's program. I would point out that the veterans committee of today functions very differently from the way the veterans committee functioned ten years ago. One might well ask, why is it we have such a fine program of veterans legislation today? Liberal members might say it is because the government introduced it and passed it. But let me also point out that it was due in part to the procedure that was

adopted in drawing up the charter. Let me remind some hon. members how that was done.

A veterans committee was set up and a number of draft bills were sent to that committee. The members of that committee were permitted to make any amendments to those draft bills that they saw fit to make. Then we sat in camera and the late Ian Mackenzie, who was then minister of veterans affairs, sat in with us and told us just how far the government would go in accepting those amendments. But mind you, we were allowed to make any amendments that we saw fit to make. Then, after we had threshed it out in camera, the government introduced bills in the house, based upon the draft bills, with the amendments made by the committee that the government had seen fit to accept. I would suggest to the parliamentary assistant that if he could persuade the government to adopt a similar practice today, it would be much fairer to the members of his own party, it would give them a chance to join with the opposition in committee in order that certain amendments or certain recommendations could be made.

I agree that the Liberal members on the committee today are in a difficult position. They know what the program of the government is; they feel they cannot join with the opposition in urging recommendations that go beyond government policy. But if the practice that was adopted in drafting the veterans charter, of putting draft bills before the committee and allowing that committee to make any amendments that it saw fit to the draft bills and then allowing the minister to sit in with the committee and tell us how far the government would go, were adopted once more, I am sure hon. members would be surprised at some of the changes that would be made in the bill. While the minister might not consider that the changes would be in the interest of the government, they certainly would be in the interest of the veterans.

I should like to join with those hon. members who have congratulated the Legion upon the brief it submitted, and also the national council of veterans associations. I think it was a very moderate brief and the government could very well accept its provisions.

The main point dealt with in the brief was the present ceilings. While it is true that the present interpretation of casual earnings helps a veteran who is able to work, this definition does not help the veteran who is unable to work nor does it help the man with a small disability pension or annuity. In the case of the man receiving a small disability pension or a gratuity the amount of that pension is subtracted from the ceiling

and what is left governs the war veterans allowance to be paid. The veteran able to work is allowed to have casual earnings of \$50 a month or \$600 a year. There is no question that there is severe discrimination against the small disability pensioner or the veteran in receipt of a small annuity.

I raised this question in the committee and a good deal of sympathy was indicated for my point of view by a number of hon. members. However, it was felt that no recommendation should be made at that time but that later when we drafted the final report we might be able to include a recommendation dealing with the question. It seems to me that the logical time to make a recommendation with regard to war veterans allowance is when the committee is reporting the war veterans allowance bill rather than to wait until the final report of the committee is made. However, if the committee sees fit before concluding its sittings to include in its final report a recommendation to take care of the situation I have just referred to I am sure the veterans will appreciate it. I would hope in that case that at a later date the government would see fit to act upon it.

I should like to join with those hon. members who have referred to the plight of the widow of the imperial veteran. For the life of me I cannot see why the government should refuse to grant a war veterans allowance to the widow of an imperial veteran who had died before completing 20 years residence in this country. The actual cost would be quite small and I hope the parliamentary assistant will again try to impress upon the government the desirability of making this change.

There was some criticism of the chairman of the committee but personally I think he did a remarkably good job. It is not easy to act as the chairman of the veterans committee because we always feel we should be given more latitude than is given to any other committee. Taking everything into consideration, I think he did a remarkably good job and he was just as lenient as could be in stretching the various rules of procedure.

Along with other hon. members I regret that the motion to increase the ceiling was voted down. If I felt that the parliamentary assistant was able to give us any assurance that the government would consider the question and perhaps do something about it at a later date I would be much easier in my mind.

In conclusion let me say that I hope the government will bear in mind the repeated recommendation of hon. members on all sides

of the house that we have a standing committee on veterans affairs so that from year to year we could review the various pieces of veterans legislation.

Miss Bennett: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended entering this debate this afternoon because I feel that that is a monopoly belonging to hon. members of this house who are veterans. However, after listening to what has been said I feel that as a member and citizen of this country I should say something for these glorious men to whom I and every hon. member of this house and every person in this country owe such a great debt.

A very strange thing is taking place in this Canadian parliament this afternoon. We are debating how much should be paid to men who have seen long years of honourable service, who have given practically everything they have to this country. As a matter of fact we would not be sitting here debating this afternoon if it had not been for what these men have done for us, particularly those who fought in the first world war.

I say this with some diffidence, but if I were a young man sitting in the galleries this afternoon hearing what I have heard in this debate I would consider for a long time before I would offer my services to this country should another emergency arise. When these men offered their services in the first great war particularly we promised them everything. We told them what they would have when they came back. We told them what rights and privileges they would have by virtue of their services to this nation. But today we find ourselves cajoling, coaxing and doing everything possible to get this government to raise the permissible income to a decent standard as requested by the veterans themselves.

I think every hon. member of this house going about his particular constituency knows very well that these men do not have a standard of living, do not have the type of home, do not have the things in their home, do not have many of the ordinary amenities of life as they are growing older that they should have and to which they are most certainly entitled.

The permissible income for single veterans has been raised to \$60 a month, but instead of raising the permissible income for married couples to \$120 a month it has been raised to only \$108. I agree with what an hon. member to my left said today, that in doing this the government would simply be doing what it has done to increase purchasing power in this country through the payment of old age pensions, family allowances and all that kind of thing. After all this would come back to

[Mr. Quelch.]

the people of this country. These veterans would have additional purchasing power and in the final analysis there would be extra employment. The benefit would be felt all through our society and all this would cost the country but very little if anything at all.

Another thing that comes to my mind is that we have a group of men who are home from the second world war and who may some day be burnt out just the same as those veterans we are discussing at this moment. What incentive are we giving these young men to save or to be thrifty? Why should they? All they have to say is, "If we do save and if we do have this money, when we reach the age when we are entitled to a burnt-out pension the amount will be deducted according to what we have saved." That situation is not fair to the veterans in this country. I do not think the citizens of Canada would approve for one moment of the bill we are attempting to pass at this moment in the House of Commons.

May I reiterate one matter which has been dealt with by practically every hon. member who has spoken today. As I say, the veterans have made it possible for us to sit here today and have made it possible for Canada to be what it is now. I think it is outrageous that we should even think of deducting the old age pension or an amount commensurate with the old age pension from these men when they reach 70 years of age. There are millionaires in this country who receive it and nothing is being deducted from them, not a cent. They receive their \$40 a month and there is no question about it.

Before this bill is passed I hope the government will reconsider these things. I think the people of Canada would expect it and I think we owe these men a tremendous unpayable debt. Nothing we can do for them would be too much and their request is fair. As men and women and as members of this house the least we can do is to comply with their request.

Mr. Cardiff: It is not my intention to take up the time of the house at this late date. Yesterday I received a telegram from one of the Legion branches in my riding and they asked me to speak for them in this debate. The telegram reads:

Members of branch 180, Canadian Legion, Wingham, request you support the maximum of war veterans allowance.

I think perhaps I would be remiss in my duties if I did not thank the Minister of Veterans Affairs for having brought in this bill and for having given the veterans some assistance; I think they expected it. On the other hand, however, the veterans feel they should have obtained the full allowance

asked for by the Canadian Legion. I think, in view of what we have heard this afternoon and in view of what we have read of the proceedings of the committee, that we are in agreement in this matter. I think it was a modest request which the Legion made; modest indeed, and I think it should have been complied with.

I cannot understand why the government insists upon not raising the permissible income of veterans. If a veteran works and makes a little money in order to help himself it is then deducted from his pension, and I do not think that is right at all.

I would like to follow the last speaker by stating that I think it is absolutely wrong that when a man reaches the age of 70 and has earned his allowance as a veteran it is deducted from his old age pension. I think he is entitled to it as a right regardless of whether or not he receives an allowance as a veteran. I do not think it should be deducted and I hope that before our young veterans reach 70 years of age some consideration will have been given to this matter.

In the county of Huron we have perhaps more veterans according to population than any riding in Canada—

Mr. Bennett: I wouldn't say that.

Mr. Cardiff: I would, according to population.

Mr. Bennett: What about Grey county?

Mr. Cardiff: We have the reputation of supplying more men to the army than any other county in the province of Ontario and I wish to say something on behalf of our veterans. I feel, as they do, that they have been very modest in their requests all down through the years. They have been given allowances piecemeal when they should have been given more, and it went on and on until the government thought it was time to raise the allowance, without being asked, after the fight which took place last year.

Now, I hope the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs will take into consideration what has been said this afternoon and that even at this late date some further consideration will be given to this matter. I shall not take up any more time because I would like to see this come to a vote.

Mr. Knowles: Most of us have been here long enough—even those members who came for the first time in 1953—to know that when legislation gets as far along as this piece of legislation has now gone the chances of the government making any changes in it are not very great. Even so, I hope that the government will pay attention to the appeals which

have been made by members of this house to the effect that the burnt-out pensioners be given a better deal than is provided in this bill, particularly with respect to the permissible income ceilings. I support wholeheartedly the appeals that have been made with respect to that phase of the matter and I support once again the appeals that have been made to make it possible for burnt-out pensioners when they draw the old age security pension to draw it without any reduction in their war veterans allowance. I support once again the appeals that have been made with regard to the widows of Imperial veterans and also the appeals made to the effect that England should be regarded as a theatre of war in relation to those who served in world war I. These indeed are the main improvements that can and should still be made and despite the fact that there is some pressure to get this bill through today in time for royal assent tonight, in order that its provisions can be effective tomorrow, I say to the government that if the minister would come into the house and agree to any of these changes that have been suggested the house would give unanimous consent at all points necessary to make these improvements before this day is through.

If that cannot be done—and the only reason it could not be done would be because of unwillingness on the part of the government—there is still another way in which this problem can be met. As hon. members know the Unemployment Insurance Act is being amended twice in this session. The Minister of Labour brought in a bill which was put through some weeks ago and is now law. Despite that fact there is now on the order paper notice of a resolution to amend it again; in fact, we might even alter the very provision that was dealt with in the bill that went through earlier. I mention that to underline the fact that is known to all of us that it is possible to amend the same statute twice in the same session. I suggest that this house would be happy to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act twice during this session. If the government feels it cannot make up its mind on this matter before the end of this day's sitting I suggest something might be done even yet before the end of this session.

Indeed all of us who are not members of the special committee on veterans affairs are pleased to learn that the committee has not finished its work and that that committee will be bringing in a report later on. I hope that the committee will consider including in that report recommendations along the lines of the representations being made here this afternoon, namely, that the provisions of the

War Veterans Allowance Act be brought up to the level of the suggestions made by the Canadian Legion and other veterans organizations.

Like others who have spoken, I do not want to delay the legislation now, but I should like to see some action on the part of the government. I certainly hope that some one of the courses being suggested by various members will be followed and that we will yet give a better deal to our burnt-out pensioners, particularly with respect to the permissible income ceilings. Like others who have spoken, I am satisfied I am speaking for a great many people, not only members of the Legion branches in my constituency and my city, not only for members in other veterans organizations but for Canadian citizens at large.

We on this side of the house are not impressed at all by the argument of some private members on the Liberal side about responsibility, namely, that they are the only ones who have to take any responsibility for the cost of proposals such as we advocate. It is time to throw out this cliché about opposition members being able to ask for anything without having to take any responsibility for it. Surely hon. members opposite know that we have to go back to our electors and face them on the question of the taxes or other costs that have to be met to satisfy the demands which we make on the floor of parliament. But I am satisfied that the people of Canada generally would like to see the best possible deal for our burnt-out pensioners.

I mentioned that I know I am speaking for the members of a number of branches in my constituency and in my city. Other members have had the same experience, I know, but I should like to put on the record the names of the branches and organizations from which I have heard recently with respect to Bill No. 164. I have heard from the Winnipeg branch, Manitoba No. 1, on Sargent Avenue in Winnipeg, as well as from the Brooklands and Weston branch of the Canadian Legion in Winnipeg North Centre. I have heard from the Valour Road branch, the St. James branch, the Imperial division No. 84, the Ukrainian veterans, the Duke of Kent branch and the Fort Rouge branch. I have also had representations from the Manitoba and northwestern Ontario provincial command and from the veterans' widows organization in my city.

These are not all the Legion branches and organizations in the city of Winnipeg but they are the ones, and they are a representative group, from which I have heard during

[Mr. Knowles.]

the time this very bill has been under discussion, and although they make their representations in different language, though they write different letters or send different telegrams, they all add up to the same thing. They feel that parliament should meet in full the modest, justifiable representations of the Canadian Legion. Once again I want to indicate my full support for these representations.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief but I wish to say a few emphatic words. I think the very least this house should consider, in honour, is to give our veterans what they have asked for this year, and everything they have asked for.

If the veterans of this country had haggled with Canada at the time of decision as disgracefully as Canada is haggling with them, this country would have been safely tucked away in a German empire long ago.

There is no conceivable excuse. What we are able to do financially depends on what we can do physically. There is not a doubt in the world that Canada is producing enough goods and services to supply more by far than all these men are asking for.

It is our business to make what is physically possible financially possible. Let the members of the government bear in mind that they have the responsibility to do that. They are loud in their protestations about their responsibilities. They do not understand half of their responsibilities. One of their most vital responsibilities is what I have mentioned, to make what is physically possible in this country today financially possible; and then, so far as our veterans are concerned, do what the veterans have asked.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): I wish to add my voice to those of all the members who have spoken today. I have had representations from the Legion branches in my riding. I know what some of these veterans have had to undergo over the years, and I do not think it is right that the government should allow conditions to exist as they are today. It is not right that the amount of permissible income should not be increased so that they can live in the way they should be able to live. As things are at the present time, the welfare organizations of the Legion branches throughout the country have to look after these veterans in many cases and help them out when they are sick, members of their families are sick or when other things happen. The welfare organizations and ladies auxiliaries of the Legion have to help these veterans and their families.

It would not cost the government one red cent to raise the ceilings on permissible

income. It is the right and fair thing to do and I know that I and everyone else feel that the ceilings should be raised to give the veterans who have fought for you and me a fair deal.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, in view of the course the debate has taken I should like to speak for two minutes. As one who has been associated with the Canadian Legion ever since that organization was formed, I do not think I could sit here very well and not participate in the discussion, if only briefly. I am not going to repeat the arguments already advanced by so many speakers. There is no need to reiterate them or put them on the record again. They have been clear, and I think for the most part they were fair and reasonable. Certainly that is true, with respect to increasing the permissive ceilings and changing the act so as to include veterans who served in England during the first war.

I have over 200 files in my office at the moment dealing with various veterans and one of the most difficult questions for me to answer is why a veteran who served in Britain in the first war cannot get the war veterans allowance when his next door neighbour is getting it who served in Newfoundland in the second world war. It seems to me that is a perfectly illogical and unfair provision, and it should be changed. As I said, I am not stressing individual arguments whatsoever. They have been put forward here, and if the government will not accept the arguments of others they certainly will not accept mine.

I should like to add a further word. I think this country has been very fortunate in the type of organization that has been looking after our veterans since the first great war. I refer to the Canadian Legion primarily but also other organizations. Without casting reflection on other organizations in other countries, I think all of us in this chamber realize that we owe a great deal to the sane leadership given our veterans in this country, particularly by the Canadian Legion. I think the Canadian Legion deserves the support of the government and the house when it approaches us with what apparently is a very reasonable proposition. You cannot expect that organization to continue to maintain its leadership and to have the support of the returned men throughout Canada unless its voice is listened to and unless it commands the respect here that it does with veterans generally. I suggest to the parliamentary assistant and to the government that there is—I will not say “danger”—that possibility.

Unless these demands are pretty well met, when they are reasonable and when they are

approved by the great majority—I believe every veteran in this house would approve of these demands—there is that possibility. Some hon. members cannot give support for obvious reasons. I am not suggesting their demands should be met in full in every case, but they should when they are reasonable, as they are in this particular case. I feel the country owes the Canadian Legion a great deal, and we should support that organization by meeting, so far as the government can possibly do so, its demands. Otherwise, we may find that the veterans in this country will receive the same type of treatment they have received in other places.

Mr. Stanton: I should like to express my opinion on this subject. I feel that we could give the veterans everything they have requested because they have not been unreasonable in their request. I have received many telegrams and personal communications from the veterans of Leeds county. They have been very moderate in their demands. The government says that they are responsible, but I do not think they are. I believe everybody would agree with me that if a plebiscite were taken in this dominion on the veterans demands, those demands would receive the wholehearted support of the people of this country. When these demands have the support of the rank and file from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I see no reason why they should be refused.

I do not wish to take up too much time, but requests have been made to me to uphold the veterans' demands and I would be very remiss in my duty if I did not raise my voice in support of them here today. While I do not believe the government will do so, I hope they will reconsider this bill and amend the act so the veterans can receive what they have requested. I believe they should have a larger permissible income because they are not going to lay away those funds. They are going to spend them for their everyday wants and that will put the money into circulation. It would not be costing the government anything. Above all things these veterans should receive the full \$40 per month when they reach 70 years of age. Other people across Canada receive that \$40 a month, regardless of their income, so why should the veteran not receive the same treatment?

Mr. Bennett: I shall be as brief as I can because we are all anxious to have this legislation passed by this house as soon as possible. First of all, I should like to acknowledge the fact that the three veterans organizations did present briefs to the special committee on veterans affairs, those being the Canadian Legion, the National Council of War Veterans

and the Canadian non-pensioned widows. As has been said, those briefs were presented in a very able manner. Although I do not share all the views expressed in the briefs, nevertheless they were presented well and in a moderate tone. I do not need to tell hon. members that these veterans organizations, all responsible bodies, have done a good deal in Canada to further the wellbeing of the veteran. Their co-operation and assistance with the Department of Veterans Affairs is reflected in no small way in the veterans charter as it stands today.

At the outset, too, I should like to say that I am sure hon. members on both sides of the house are genuinely and deeply concerned with the welfare of the older veterans, particularly the veteran who saw combat service. I think we all recognize what we owe to these veterans, and I think we are all anxious to do just as much as we can to help them.

I have listened with great interest to the speeches made here because I am a green horn in the field of veterans affairs. Many of the members who have spoken have had a great deal of experience. I hope that in my reply I do not sound dogmatic because, as hon. members know, this side of the house is charged with the responsibility of setting the rates and ceilings. No one can say definitely if \$1,440 is right or \$1,500 is right. I am going to try to place on the record some of the thinking of the government as I know it.

Most of the criticism today has been levelled at the permissible ceiling. I think hon. members will agree that when you discuss the amount of the ceiling you have to take into consideration all the benefits which are available to war veterans allowance recipients. You also have to take into consideration the historical background of the war veterans allowance legislation, the purpose for which it was set up and its scope. I feel some members have the wrong conception of war veterans allowances, because of some of the statements made here today.

It has been said many times that the War Veterans Allowance Act is welfare legislation based along old age pension lines, payable to veterans who have seen service in an actual theatre of war but 10 years sooner because those people are pre-aged by 10 years as a result of that service.

Now, that proposition has often been laid down. The Hon. J. H. King, minister of pensions and national health at the time the old age pension act was introduced in 1926, pointed out that an additional clause should be inserted giving special consideration to veterans who, while not 70 years of age, fulfilled the other requirements of that act.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Then, four years later, the War Veterans Allowance Act did provide the equivalent of the old age pension under the same means test for a restricted group of needy veterans at age 60, or younger, if they were incapable of supporting themselves. On March 4, 1930, Mr. King said in connection with war veterans allowance legislation:

It is not considered a pension matter in the sense that we have been discussing pensions heretofore. This is an allowance to the veterans.

During the same debate Mr. Mackenzie King said:

This measure has been introduced amongst other things to give relief to the man of 45, 50 or 60 years of age, who is prematurely aged. Instead of having to wait until 70 years of age, as he would under the Old Age Pension Act, the returned soldier will receive the equivalent of the old age pension at the age of 60, or if declared "burnt-out", as it is expressed, he may receive this equivalent at much earlier age, at any age in fact.

The Minister of Veterans Affairs said the other evening in a broadcast on the "Nation's Business", that the War Veterans Allowance Act had been, from its inception, a social security measure designed especially to meet conditions peculiar to veterans who have seen combat service. Sir Arthur Currie, when he was grand president of the Canadian Legion, called it a fine piece of social legislation.

Our predecessors who were responsible for the various acts which we now call the veterans charter decided then that there was an altogether different base for the assistance available to the veteran under the War Veterans Allowance Act, as compared to the pensions paid to veterans suffering from disabilities related directly to war service under the pension act or to the dependents of veterans who gave their lives in the service of their country.

It has been argued on the other side of the house that war veterans allowance legislation should not be compared with welfare legislation or with the Pension Act, but that it should stand on its own legs. Well, I think it is elementary—indeed some hon. members opposite have agreed with this—that when we consider the benefits under an act such as the War Veterans Allowance Act we must consider other welfare legislation and the Pension Act, just in the same way as it is our duty in parliament at all times to keep in mind and to compare the needs of all groups and classes making up this great nation. There must be a balance maintained.

I would remind hon. members that under the Old Age Pension Act a civilian gets \$40 a month, and a married couple, if they both qualify as to age, receive \$80. But remember that in my own province of Ontario, for instance, if there is a married man at the age of 70 whose wife is aged 63, that married

man gets only \$40 a month. There are no old age pension supplements in the majority of the provinces.

Now, comparing the war veterans allowance with disability pensions, the ceiling of \$70 a month is the equivalent of a veteran who has a disability assessed at 56 per cent. The ceiling, recommended by the veterans organizations and by all hon. members opposite, of \$1,200 for a single man, would amount to a disability pension of 80 per cent, or only \$25 a month less than the 100 per cent disability pensioner receives.

The \$120 ceiling contained in Bill 164 is the equivalent of a 70 per cent disability pension, whereas the recommended ceiling of \$2,000 would be just about the same as a 100 per cent disability pensioner receives, namely \$2,040, if a married man.

Mr. Knowles: But is it fair to compare the ceilings in one case with the amounts paid in the other?

Mr. Bennett: Yes, it is fair, in view of the assistance fund; and I shall come to that later. It is true a veteran will receive \$60 and if he needs it \$70, and in the same way a married veteran can receive \$120. As I say, while all of us would like to see the older veteran as well off as possible, still I think we have a pretty fair bill in front of us. We are all familiar with the terms of it: A single man gets \$60 and, as I have said, if he needs it he can be paid \$70. That is \$10 more than the veterans organizations recommended. The ceiling, of course, is \$70.

But the big point I wish to make to hon. members of the opposition is this, that raising the ceiling will not help the man who has no outside income; and I suggest he is our basic man. The War Veterans Allowance Act was set up to help needy veterans, those who were without income. Raising the ceiling will not help them. Hon. members opposite seem perfectly content with the \$60 for the man who has no outside income, and that is all he can get. Now under the act we can pay \$10 more, and for a married man we can pay him up to \$120; and that is what was recommended by the veterans organizations. The ceiling is \$120 for the married man.

But once again our basic man is surely the man without income. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra said, and quite rightly, that there are 20,648 veterans on war veterans allowance who have no other income. In other words, half the W.V.A. veterans have no other income. I say to hon. members that raising the ceiling will not help them; but hon. members opposite do not seem to be concerned with that fact. They say, "Oh, they are all right." They are trying to help the fellow who has income.

60—1955—3

Mr. Knowles: Raising the ceiling would help those over 70.

Mr. Brooks: Would that not help the veteran over 70?

Mr. Bennett: I will come to that. And may I say I was quiet as a mouse when you fellows were directing your barrage at me today. I would ask the same consideration.

Mr. Knowles: Maybe you had nothing to say.

Mr. Bennett: I have plenty to say.

Mr. Martin: And saying it very well indeed.

Mr. Bennett: It is estimated that the cost of the increase in rates and ceilings in Bill 164 will amount to about \$9,250,000. All the present recipients of war veterans allowances will benefit from this expenditure. The proposal to raise the ceiling to \$1,200 and \$2,000 respectively would cost \$12,500,000, in addition to the \$9,250,000, or a total additional expenditure of \$21,750,000.

The extra \$12,500,000 to raise the ceilings would not benefit the 20,648 at all. They would not get a cent of it. It would go only to those who have incomes. I would point out to hon. members opposite that \$12 million is a lot of money. It is a substantial portion of the total expenditures on war veterans allowances in 1954-55, which in round figures amounted to \$28 million.

I notice it is about six o'clock. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Chairman, before the dinner recess I was discussing the amount of the permissible income ceilings in the bill. Once again I should like to say that I am putting on the record some of the reasoning of the government for the setting of the ceilings at the limits in Bill No. 164. I think hon. members opposite will concede that perhaps it is easier to make a speech urging the raising of rates and ceilings than it is to make one to defend a certain limit, no matter where that limit may be drawn. I want to say once again that we on this side of the house are just as interested in the older veteran as hon. members who have spoken on the other side of the house. When you draw the line in welfare legislation, no matter where you draw it, there will be some inconsistencies, inequities and cases of hardship.

The hon. member for Royal drew our attention to three or four cases, as did other hon. members. The first one was the case of the veteran with a small disability pension. The hon. member for Acadia also feels very strongly on this point. We are all very sympathetic toward the disability pensioner. As I understand it, the point is that under our present ceiling the veteran with the small disability pension is losing the benefit of a portion of that pension. I say to hon. members that the same argument would apply exactly with the ceiling at \$100 a month. For instance, a single person with a disability pension of 30 per cent would receive \$37.50 pension and \$60 veterans allowance, or a total of \$97.50, which is just about the same amount as the 80 per cent pensioner gets. Surely, the 80 per cent pensioner would say: my disability pension is being wasted.

I do not know what is in the mind of hon. members opposite, but—

Mr. Quelch: On account of the casual earnings being allowed in the sum of \$50 a month, or \$600 a year, the disability pension should be placed in the same category up to \$600.

Mr. Bennett: By doing that you are equalizing the 30 per cent disability pensioner and the 80 per cent disability pensioner. Surely the 80 per cent veteran or the fellow at 100 per cent would say: well, I am getting the same pension now as the man on a 50 per cent disability pension. If hon. members mean that they want to exempt disability pensions altogether, I would point out that that would cost over \$10 million, and a married man on a 100 per cent disability pension would get \$170 a month disability pension and \$108 war veterans allowance, or a total of \$278 a month. The War Veterans Allowance Act was not intended to work in that way or for that purpose.

The second case the hon. member for Royal brought up was the old age pensioner. The hon. member said if a veteran were receiving war veterans allowance, when he became 70 his war veterans allowance would be reduced, which is perfectly correct. A single man would get \$40 old age pension and he would get an allowance to the extent of \$30 under the present bill. But the hon. member for Royal knows perfectly well the answer to that. He knows that the war veterans allowance legislation is old age pension legislation, but the pension is granted to veterans ten years before it is granted to civilians and on much more generous terms.

I said this afternoon that in Ontario a married man at age 70 with a wife 63, if he is a civilian, gets \$40. Our veteran gets either

[Mr. Bennett.]

\$108 or \$120. To pay him a full war veterans allowance at 70 would be to pay him the old age pension twice.

The third case that the hon. member for Royal brought up was that of a man with a small pension. He said that the man with a small pension was losing the benefit of part of that pension because of the ceiling we have in the act at the present time. Surely the same argument would apply if we had the ceiling at \$1,000 or \$1,200. Take a veteran with a small pension of \$60. With the ceiling at \$1,200 he would get \$60 pension and only \$40 war veterans allowance. He would be losing \$20. And have hon. members ever thought of the man of age 60 who wants to work? He is, say, getting \$2,200 and he wants to continue to work, and yet he has a pension coming to him. Certainly, it would be quite an inducement to him to say: I can retire at 60 on \$2,000. Would not hon. members opposite say then that that would be a measure to discourage people from working when they reached age 60 and could retire on an income of \$2,000?

Mr. Brooks: May I just correct the hon. member? My argument was that it is based on the cost of living, or should be. It should be based on need. What I said was that a man with a small pension of \$25 or \$35 a month should have his full veterans allowance so that his income would be brought up to a decent figure of between \$1,000 and \$1,200. If that were done he would have something on which to live. I did not mention any large amount such as \$50 or \$60 over and above his war veterans allowance. I was thinking of \$25 or \$30.

Mr. Bennett: I do not think we have time to argue across the floor. But what amazes me, as I said this afternoon, is that the hon. member for Royal is perfectly satisfied for the married man who has no income to live on \$120 a month or the single man on \$60.

Mr. Brooks: The same principle applies.

Mr. Bennett: He has no other income. The hon. member is satisfied with that.

The next point the hon. member for Royal made—and I am not picking on him; he acted as the official spokesman for the opposition and I think he mentioned nearly all the points that were covered by the other speakers—was that we were discriminating against the veteran who wanted to go out and work. It is quite true under the present set-up of casual earnings that a person can go out and make more money than the veteran who cannot work. But the same thing would apply if you had a ceiling of \$1,200. The man with an income of \$1,200 who went out to work would have a greater

amount than the man with \$1,200 who had to stay at home. These arguments apply all the way down the line, no matter where the ceiling is set.

Mr. Brooks: No.

Mr. Bennett: The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra is usually pretty careful in what he says. I do not think he gave a full explanation of one thing this afternoon. He mentioned that 20,648 veterans were receiving war veterans allowances and they had no other income. He said that 5,581 were receiving benefits from the assistance fund. That leaves a remainder of 15,067 individuals who have no other income and who are not getting assistance from the assistance fund. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra said that when he asked the departmental officials about that they replied that they did not apply. That is true, but the acting deputy minister also said this:

I will only make one observation, and that is these 15,067 are either getting along satisfactorily on the basic rate because they are living in areas where the cost of living is not too high, or they are augmenting their incomes.

I said at the outset that when you consider the adequacy or inadequacy of the ceilings you must take into consideration all the benefits of the act. I must not talk out this bill, but I do want to remind hon. members that we have a reasonable set-up for the war veterans allowance recipients.

The minister announced the other night that the assistance fund has been liberalized. This fund now includes two more factors in computing the monthly grants under the fund. Evidence was given before the committee that the assistance fund is being administered very sympathetically and that over 90 per cent of the applications for assistance from the fund are being approved.

I think hon. members are familiar with the new interpretation of casual earnings. They all agree that this new interpretation is a very generous one. A veteran who can go out and work can certainly augment his war veterans allowance. I commend all hon. members to read that directive which is appended to the appendices of the proceedings No. 3 of the special committee on veterans affairs of this year.

There is also a farm directive which makes the position of the war veterans allowance recipient engaged in farming a much better one. Many farmers are now eligible under the War Veterans Allowance Act who were not eligible previously.

There is just one more directive to which I want to draw the attention of hon. members. This is a new one that applies particularly to the recipients of war veterans allowances

who take in boarders and lodgers. This is a most generous directive and it is important because many war veterans allowance recipients cannot go out to work but are able to supplement their income by taking people into their homes.

I wish to mention too that war veterans allowance recipients are entitled to free medical treatment for any condition. Last year this cost over \$9 million, which is roughly one-quarter of the total amount spent on war veterans allowances.

Just a word on the work of the committee on veterans affairs. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Cape Breton South state that during the last five years the committee has not been as effective. The hon. member is reported on page 2559 of *Hansard* of March 30 as having said:

Then the committee had the right to examine legislation and make recommendations.

I would remind the hon. member for Cape Breton South that last year he made a couple of recommendations in the committee on which the government acted and the government subsequently amended the legislation. This year the committee decided to report this bill at this time in order to have the increased payments go into effect for the benefit of the veterans, on the understanding we would draw up our final report at a later date when we would take all these problems into consideration. It might well be that the committee will recommend to the government certain changes in the legislation.

Mr. Brooks: That will not benefit this bill.

Mr. Bennett: That is perfectly true, but bills can always be brought into the house by the government. The hon. member for Royal in his speech left the impression that he was stifled as far as getting information from the committee was concerned. I do not understand that because a good deal of information and material was laid before the committee. We had the acting deputy minister there, the deputy minister being overseas on leave of absence.

Mr. Brooks: I think the hon. member will admit that I was discussing casual earnings. On a number of occasions the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra asked the number who were under the casual earnings provisions. We could not get any information regarding casual earnings at all.

Mr. Bennett: I admit that there was no answer given to the question about casual earnings. I do not think the veterans of this country nor the government want to keep tab on the earnings of veterans doing such things as lawn-mowing, snow-shovelling and

so on. The hon. member for Royal did leave the impression that he did not get all the information he required because he said, "I do not know whether the ceiling should be \$1,200, \$2,000 or maybe less; I do not know whether the rate is right at \$108 because no study was made of it."

I want to tell the hon. member that the Liberal members have studied it; the Department of Veterans Affairs has studied it. This Bill No. 164 is no hit-or-miss legislation; it is the result of a lot of research and study on the part of the officials of the department and of the government.

Mr. Brooks: You must have been given a lot of information we were not given.

Mr. Bennett: All the officials were sitting there and when there were no more questions we started to consider the bill.

I want to say that this war veterans allowance legislation is always under constant study, always with the object in view of making sure it is meeting the needs of the older veterans. The original act was passed in 1930 and it was amended in 1936, 1938, 1946, 1948, 1950, 1952 and the present amendment. The regulations have been amended by order in council in 1941, 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946.

Do hon. members opposite note anything significant there? If they do not, may I tell them that there were no amendments made to the act or the regulations in the period 1930-35. But since that hiatus 1930-35, when a Conservative government was in power, there has been steady and regular progress towards working out a better deal for the older veteran.

I should like to say to the hon. member for Halton, for whom I have the highest regard, that this afternoon she seemed more concerned about the older veterans than her namesake and my namesake was in the 30's.

Mr. Pearkes: No man was more concerned about the older veterans than R. B. Bennett.

Mr. Bennett: When I talk about a better deal I am talking in terms of increased ceilings and increased rates, a better formula under the assistance fund, a wider interpretation of casual earnings, an easier lot for the veteran engaged in farming and free medical treatment provided for the war veterans allowance recipients.

Perhaps it is not true to say that we have to be more realistic on this side of the house, but I think it is realistic to say that the increases in the rates and ceilings provided by Bill No. 164 are substantial. To summarize these increases, the single man under

[Mr. Bennett.]

the new bill gets an increase of \$10 whether he has outside income or not. The married man, if he has outside income, gets an increase of \$20, that is if he is on old age pension or has some outside income. The married man with no outside income gets an increase of \$18. Under this bill every recipient gets a raise of \$10 if single or \$18 or \$20 if married. I submit that those are substantial increases and I think the veterans across the country think they are substantial.

Hon. members opposite have been reading telegrams. There are four Legion branches in my riding and I have not heard from one of them. I have not had a telegram or a letter. I have not heard from my zone. I talked to many veterans during the weekends and I would suggest to hon. members opposite when they go home for the Easter recess that they talk to the veterans in their own constituencies, who I am sure will express to them their gratitude to the government for this legislation.

In closing I want to repeat that we on this side are vitally interested in the older veterans. We are going to watch this legislation in operation. If there are gaps in the program, if there are deficiencies in the legislation we will plug them as we have in the past.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the veterans of this country would be interested if they were here this evening in hearing the applause by Liberal members when it was indicated that the government does not intend to act upon the recommendations and suggestions of the Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans. If they were here tonight they would be interested in hearing the applause that greeted the words of the hon. gentleman as he spoke rather disparagingly of the fight which we in the opposition have put up on behalf, not of something ephemeral and fantastic but of something that is asked for, and reasonably asked for by the Canadian Legion and the National Council of Veterans Organizations.

I say this, sir, as one who has been a member of that Legion for well over 30 years, that it is a proud organization and nothing can be a matter of greater pride than to belong to it. It has always been characterized in its representations by sound and patriotic considerations and there has been no endeavour at any time to make block raids on the treasury, as has been the case in some other parts of the world. That deserves to be said. Let me say something more. This measure was held up until the last possible moment.

Mr. Hosking: By our party.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We cannot continue the fight. Did the hon. member for Wellington South have something to say?

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): He said, "By our party".

Mr. Diefenbaker: My hon. friend from Wellington South says by his party. It certainly has been a fight by silence. That is what has happened in so far as the Liberal party is concerned in reference to this matter. I say, sir, that tonight we have to give up this fight because in a matter of a few minutes this legislation has to be brought before the Senate. If it were not for that fact my hon. friends on the other side of the house who laugh and jeer at the fight we have put up would have an opportunity tonight to express by vote what their voice in secret.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: However, that opportunity is not going to be given to them tonight for the reason that it is impossible for us to make that motion which could be made, thereby enabling the hon. members who support the government who remain silent in parliament but who in secret say that something more should be done than is being done under this legislation to express their real feelings. But, oh, behind closed doors or outside of parliament or in their letters to their constituents or to the Canadian Legion they invariably say, "We are all for it; wait until the committee starts sitting and action will take place".

When that committee sat, Mr. Chairman, it was handed a dish and told, "This is your dish; this is what you accept; no other ingredients will be allowed to be placed in that dish". And when my hon. friend the member for Hastings-Frontenac, and my hon. friend the member for Vancouver-Quadra, in that committee endeavoured by the motion to which reference was made today to have implemented the reasonable request of the Canadian Legion, that motion was voted down and every Liberal member did exactly what the government intended them to do when it placed this measure before the committee complete and in its entirety.

I am going to say nothing more at this time. There is no opportunity on second reading for us to secure a vote on this matter. As far as it goes it is acceptable but as far as parliament is concerned no action can be taken; we are handcuffed. Regardless of how many hon. members in this house would vote for the representation of the Legion and the national council in their entirety we cannot

do anything because this is a money bill that muzzles and handcuffs private members.

My hon. friend brought up the period from 1930 to 1935. How old were the veterans then? They were 32, 38, 39 or 40—

Mr. McIlraith: No. There were a lot of them around Ottawa in real difficulty.

Mr. Bennett: Many were on war veterans allowance and that is why the Liberal government introduced the measure.

Mr. Diefenbaker: My hon. friend brought that up and he realizes the change that comes over these men in a matter of 20 or 25 years.

Now, sir, one more word. If the government had not intended to railroad this legislation through in its present form it would have submitted a draft bill to the committee and would have presented them with an opportunity to give consideration to what should be incorporated in that bill. Instead, the government produced a bill before that committee and on party grounds alone the Liberal members of that committee stood united against the representations which were made by the two bodies to which I have made reference.

There is nothing more that we can do. The members on this side of the house without regard to the position of the opposition have endeavoured to secure action by representation. Their representations have been disregarded; nothing has been done to answer them. There is nothing more we can do because the Governor General waits, and if we were to move an amendment this evening we would find ourselves in the position where it would be too late to have this matter brought before the Senate. Half a loaf is better than no bread, and therefore, as far as I am concerned, having expressed the strongest possible condemnation of the government's attitude in failing to do what is reasonable and fair for the Legion which has itself always been reasonable and fair, we can do nothing more.

We have expressed our opinion and having fought to the last moment we can simply say that as far as the government is concerned it has the majority and it has made the decision. There is nothing that we can do to prevent your failing to carry into effect the reasonable representations that have been made by the hon. members who have spoken and that, as far as I am concerned, concludes this question. We have tried.

My hon. friend says that he has not had any representations; it must be that his parliamentary secretarial position has insulated him from the representations that

hon. members in every part of the house have received in recent days.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

On clause 3—*Surviving spouse*.

Mr. Bennett: I have an amendment which I understand the Minister of National Health and Welfare is prepared to move.

Mr. Martin: I move:

That clause 3 of Bill No. 164 be renumbered as "3. (1)" and that a new subclause (2) be added to clause 3, as follows:

(2) Where any veteran or surviving spouse of a veteran was receiving or was eligible to receive an amount under section 5 of the said act as it was immediately prior to the date of the coming into force of this act, in respect of a period ending on or after that date, the district authority may, in its discretion and in lieu of any further amount under that section, award to such veteran or spouse (a) in respect of the portion of that period that is prior to that date, an amount determined in accordance with subsection (1) or (2), as the case may be, of section 5 of the said act as it was immediately prior to the coming into force of this act, and (b) in respect of the portion of that period that is on or after that date, an allowance determined in accordance with subsection (1), (2) or (3), as the case may be, of section 5 of the said act as enacted by this section, less any amount received by such veteran or spouse in respect of that period pursuant to an award made under section 5 of the said act as it was immediately prior to the coming into force of this act.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Mr. Brooks: On division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

INCREASE IN INDEMNITY OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Hon. Jean Lesage (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources) moved the second reading of Bill No. 179, to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 1—*Sessional indemnity to elected members*.

Mr. Lesage: Mr. Chairman, when we were at the resolution stage the hon. member for Mackenzie River made the following suggestion, and I quote from page 1496 of *Hansard* of February 24:

I would like to suggest to the minister that when he brings the bill in he have it provide a minimum of at least \$1,000 a year. That would

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

enable the members of the council to visit their constituencies and I think it would be a fair minimum.

I may say that the government has accepted the suggestion, and consequently I will ask my colleague the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, to move the following amendment to clause 1:

That clause 1 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"1. Subsection (1) of section 12 of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter 331 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

12. (1) Subject to this section (a) where in any one calendar year the total number of days on which there was a sitting of the council is ten or less, each elected member may be paid in that year an indemnity of one thousand dollars, less one hundred dollars for every such day on which the member was not in attendance,

(b) where in any one calendar year the total number of days on which there was a sitting of the council is greater than ten, each elected member may be paid in that year an indemnity at the rate of one hundred dollars for each such day on which the member was in attendance, or two thousand dollars, whichever is the lesser."

Mr. Prudham: I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that this bill be read a third time now?

Mr. Knowles: By leave.

Mr. Lesage moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

YUKON ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LIVING ALLOWANCE AND ATTENDANCE OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Hon. Jean Lesage (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources) moved the second reading of Bill No. 180, to amend the Yukon Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 1—*When member deemed in attendance for purpose of ascertaining indemnity*.

Mr. Lesage: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, to move an amendment to this clause which will have the same effect as the amendment moved a few moments

ago when we were dealing with the Northwest Territories amending bill.

Mr. Prudham: Mr. Chairman I move:

That clause 1 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"1. (1) Subsection (1) of section 15 of the Yukon Act, chapter 53 of the statutes of 1952-53, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

15. (1) The commissioner in council may provide for the payment out of the Yukon consolidated revenue fund of indemnities to members of the council, allowances for living expenses, and travelling expenses as follows: (a) where in any one calendar year the total number of days on which there was a sitting of the council is ten or less, each member may be paid in that year an indemnity of one thousand dollars, less one hundred dollars for each such day on which the member was not in attendance, (b) where in any one calendar year the total number of days on which there was a sitting of the council is greater than ten, each member may be paid in that year an indemnity at the rate of one hundred dollars for each such day on which the member was in attendance, or two thousand dollars, whichever is the lesser, (c) an allowance for living expenses, not exceeding twenty-five dollars for each day he is in attendance at a session of the council, and (d) the actual travelling expenses incurred by the member in travelling from his place of residence to the place where the council holds its session and return, but no payment shall be made to a member in respect of more than one return trip for each session of the council.

(2) Section 15 of the said act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

(3) For the purpose of ascertaining the indemnity to which a member is entitled under subsection (1), each day on which a member is in the place where a session of the council is held but is because of illness unable to be in attendance at the session shall be deemed to be a day on which he is in attendance at the session.

(4) For the purpose of ascertaining a member's allowance for living expenses, (a) each day during a session on which there has been no sitting of the council in consequence of its having adjourned over that day, and (b) each day on which a member is in the place where the session is held but is because of illness unable to be in attendance at the session, shall be deemed to be a day on which he is in attendance at the session."

Mr. Knowles: May I ask the minister one question? In the amendment now moved reference is made to living allowances as well as to the indemnity. I did not notice anything comparable in the previous bill. Is there any significance?

Mr. Lesage: No, but it is in the bill, as printed, Mr. Chairman. If hon. members will look at the bill as originally printed before the amendment, they will see that subclause 2 deals with allowances for living expenses.

Mr. Knowles: I am afraid the minister did not catch my point. My question relates to the fact that although there are living allowances in this bill I did not notice any reference to that in the previous bill.

Mr. Lesage: The Northwest Territories Act was amended last year to that effect. The provisions provided in subclauses 2, 3 and 4

60-1955-41

are for the purpose of bringing the terms of the Yukon Act into conformity with the Northwest Territories Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1 as amended agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall this bill be read a third time, now?

Mr. Knowles: By leave.

Mr. Lesage moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEFINITIONS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, ETC.

The house resumed, from Monday, February 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lesage for the second reading of Bill No. 182, to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act.

Mr. A. M. Fraser (St. John's East): In rising to take part in the debate on Bill No. 182, I should like to remind the house that the province of Newfoundland is singularly rich in records of the past and in historic places. Indeed, as the house knows, this fact was emphasized by the Massey commission in its report, reference to which was made earlier in this debate by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. MacLean). I should like to draw to the attention of this house, and in particular to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage) that one of the historic sites of Newfoundland has recently been offered to the federal government by the government of Newfoundland to be developed as an historic national park. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Signal Hill area at St. John's.

Signal Hill, Mr. Speaker, is a site of exceptional historic significance. It is a lofty eminence situated on the east side of the Narrows, as the entrance to St. John's harbour is called. On the summit of Signal Hill stands Cabot Tower, a stone building erected to commemorate the fourth centenary of the discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot on St. John's day, June 24, 1497. Signal Hill dominates the seaward approaches to the capital city of the great island which was Britain's oldest colony and is now Canada's youngest province. Ever since Sir Humphrey Gilbert, that intrepid but ill-fated adventurer

and explorer, took possession of the "New Found Land" in the name of his sovereign, Queen Elizabeth I, on August 5, 1583, Signal Hill has formed a natural bastion guarding this strategic seaport.

In particular, Signal Hill played an important part in the long Franco-British duel for supremacy in North America. Throughout the epic struggle which has been so aptly described as the second hundred years war, Signal Hill provided St. John's with an impregnable defence against direct attack from the sea. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Signal Hill was the scene of the last battle fought on Newfoundland soil. It was also, I believe, the last land battle fought in British North America between the British and French for the possession of what is now Canada, the great country in which these two historic races now live side by side in amity and peace.

This battle, known as the battle of Signal Hill, was fought on September 15, 1762, in the closing phase of the Seven Years' War. In the summer of that year, the French had captured St. John's, but a relief force was dispatched in an attempt to recapture the city and that force attacked the French defences which had been organized on Signal Hill. There, on September 15, a decisive battle was fought. The French defences were stormed and after a gallant resistance, Signal Hill was taken. Signal Hill is hallowed by the blood of the brave men of both races who fell in this fierce encounter.

Monsieur l'Orateur, Signal Hill est consacré par le sang des braves soldats, des deux races, qui ont été tués au cours de cette féroce bataille.

After the defeat of the French garrison on Signal Hill, Mr. Speaker, the French occupation of St. John's ended. It was not, however, the last occasion on which St. John's was threatened by the French. In the course of the war of the French Revolution, a formidable French fleet, under Admiral Richery, stood in St. John's on September 3, 1796, with the evident intention of attempting a landing. However, Richery was so impressed by the strength of the fortifications and by the martial appearance of the three or four thousand men, including units of the recently formed Royal Newfoundland Regiment, whom the energetic Admiral, Sir Richard Wallace, had assembled on Signal Hill that the French fleet abandoned its designs on St. John's and contented itself with a raid on Bay Bulls.

It is not, however, only in the history of war that Signal Hill has won renown. It is also famous for its intimate association with one of the outstanding achievements of scientific progress. It was in Cabot Tower on

[Mr. Fraser (St. John's East).]

Signal Hill that the great Marconi received his historic message from Poldhu in Cornwall on December 12, 1901, and thus established the first communication by wireless telegraph across the Atlantic ocean. Here is how the inventor described that great moment:

It was about half-past twelve, I remember, when quite unmistakably three faint clicks in the telephone sounded several times in my ear. I listened again and again; but I wanted corroboration. I turned to my assistant: "Can you hear anything, Mr. Kemp?" I asked, handing him the telephone. He listened and heard it too.

Faintly, but with unquestionable certainty, we were receiving signals, tapped by our kite aerial, which had left Poldhu and traversed the Atlantic, serenely ignoring the earth's curve which so many doubters had considered a fatal obstacle.

On the following day the signals were again heard. The great experiment had succeeded.

That is the end of the quotation from Signor Marconi's statement of his feelings at that great moment. Thus, it was on Signal Hill that the historic feat of bridging the Atlantic by wireless was first accomplished.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that these glimpses of its storied past will justify the claim of Signal Hill to be ranked as one of the most historic sites in all Canada.

I would add however, Mr. Speaker, that Signal Hill is not only a landmark of absorbing historic interest; it is also a place of scenic charm and beauty. It possesses that rugged grandeur so characteristic of the storm-swept shores of Newfoundland. Moreover, its terrain lends itself naturally to landscaping and terracing. From its bold slopes and, above all, from its majestic summit, as one looks landward, there is an incomparable view of the historic city of St. John's and of the lovely countryside beyond. Then, as the eye turns seaward, it beholds the mighty surge of the Atlantic rollers and the ever-changing inter-play of sky and ocean.

This, then, is the area which the government of the province of Newfoundland has recently decided to offer to the government of Canada as an area to be developed as an historic national park. The offer was officially announced in St. John's on December 22, 1954, by the Hon. Dr. F. W. Rowe, minister of mines and resources in the provincial government.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Canada will accept that offer in the spirit in which it has been made. By doing so it will give fitting recognition to one of the most historic sites in all this great country.

Mr. G. C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with great interest and pleasure to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Fraser) who has told us about the historic significance of

Signal Hill, in the island of Newfoundland. We appreciate what he has said all the more because we know that the hon. member is an historian in his own right, and one who takes a great deal of interest in the bill now before us. I trust that he will support a suggestion I am going to make in connection with the bill before the debate is concluded.

I think, frankly, that this measure is more important than perhaps would appear from the interest which sometimes is paid to legislation such as this. I think the hon. member for St. John's East will agree with me when I say that in this country we have not always given to the preservation of historic sites the attention the subject deserves. That distinguished Nova Scotian, Joseph Howe, who, I might say, was also a distinguished Liberal—although afterwards he saw the error of his ways and joined the Conservative party—once said that an intelligent people erected monuments to the memory of those who had gone before. I think in this country we have been sadly lacking in that respect. However in my view this bill is a step in the right direction, a step toward correcting the errors we have committed in the past.

Since the hon. member referred to something in his own constituency, possibly I would be pardoned, coming as I do from the most historic constituency in Canada, if I were to follow his example by making reference to my own constituency. Applause was given this afternoon when it was announced that a celebration will take place in the coming summer of the anniversary of the return of the Acadians to Grand Pre, and that it will be the 200th anniversary of that event. I am very happy and proud of the fact that the village of Grand Pre, one of the outstanding historic points on this whole continent, is located at one end of my constituency, while at the western part of it lies the little village of Port Royal, the first establishment of the white man north of the gulf of Mexico. At that point this summer we are celebrating the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the white man in what is now North America.

Sometimes my hon. friends from the province of Quebec boast of the fact that settlements were achieved there. I must say however, without reflecting in any way upon them, that after all a base had to be established first in my constituency in order to get their roots firmly in the ground. And it was from there that Champlain and the others moved on, and went up the St. Lawrence in order to find what they did. Because I am sure if they had not had the Annapolis valley to return to they would have become discouraged and gone back to France before establishing a settlement.

In any event there will be in my constituency this summer those two remarkable anniversaries, a bi-centenary in one instance and a 350th anniversary in the other. And so it is fitting that tonight we should pay something more than casual attention to the bill now before us for second reading.

In that connection I would mention that I think it is more important to preserve historic sites than to erect monuments. For instance, at Grand Pre, by a combination of efforts on the part of the railways, religious organizations and possibly others, we have a magnificent park marking the original location of the village. At Grand Pre, we have an exact replica of the Acadian church, and we still have preserved what is presumed to be, and what I believe is, the original well, known as the Evangeline well, from which the people who were confined in the church prior to expulsion obtained their water during the days they were there.

That is an historic site. And I suggest to you, sir, that it is much more important to preserve these sites than to erect monuments which do not attract great interest, and which may be ignored. The government of Canada deserves a great deal of commendation because of the fact that at Port Royal it has restored the original habitation in which the first government of this country was carried on, in which the first trading transactions took place, and where the first residences were established. Some time prior to the war—I think it was either in 1936 or 1937—this government finally obtained in Paris the original plans of the old habitation. It has been rebuilt according to the exact measurements, with wooden pegs—no nails used whatsoever—with isinglass for windows, with skins for walls, and with the partitions set out as they were in the days when Champlain established that habitation so many years ago.

Nothing could be more valuable than an historic site of that kind. I do hope that when this board carries on its work, as it will in the future, it will go further in the preservation and reconstruction of such sites rather than, as I said, proceed with the erection of memorials at the side of roads, memorials which are usually ignored because, when travelling along at 60 miles an hour, one passes these points of interest before he knows what they are and does not bother to turn around to look into them further.

The historic sites and monuments board deserves great credit for the work it has done in the past. For years it operated under orders in council. The members of the board were a group of men who gave their time

gratuitously to this work and, although I believe there was a great deal more that should have been done, the fact that it was not done was not the fault of the board. They were given very little money and, I think, very little encouragement. And yet, it was owing to their effort that there was a renaissance in historic interest in this country. Now that we have a body incorporated in the act which we are amending tonight, I think it is fitting that we pay tribute to these men who for over 30 years carried on as members of the historic sites and monuments board. But there is one matter that I should like to suggest to the minister in this connection. I noticed in the debate which was adjourned a month or more ago the minister was discussing the details of this bill. He pointed out that the membership was increased in Ontario and Quebec from one member to two members. He said that was owing to the fact that the Massey commission had so recommended. With that I agree. I noticed this afternoon the Prime Minister referred to a part of the Massey commission report and said that he supported it and accepted it in that connection. I agree. I suggest to the minister that in connection with the historic sites and monuments board, the Massey report said—and I draw this to the attention of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Fraser), who is an historian in his own right—that two members of this historic sites and monument board should be nominated by the historical association of Canada, the association of professional historians. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a recommendation which the minister should carry out.

On the board as it is now constituted we have, outside of the official designations, one member from every province.

Mr. Lesage: And every member is a member of the Canadian historical society.

Mr. Nowlan: Every member may be, Mr. Speaker; I am not questioning the minister on that. If he says so, I accept his word.

Mr. Lesage: Four members are past-presidents.

Mr. Nowlan: I am saying that no member was recommended by the Canadian historical sites and monuments board. Under the orders in council which constituted this historical sites and monument board in the past, one qualification for membership was that the individual should be a recognized Canadian historian, and there is no such qualification in this bill. The minister says, of course, that they are all members of the Canadian historical association, but there is nothing

[Mr. Nowlan.]

to hinder him in the future from appointing someone else who not only may not be a member of the Canadian historical association, but may not have any knowledge whatsoever of history.

The historical association has done a great deal in preserving and perpetuating the history of this country through their papers and their documents, and I think it would be very fitting indeed to recognize the contribution that the association is making to the history of this country. As a matter of courtesy, if nothing else, the association ought to be asked to nominate at least two members to the board, as was recommended by the Massey commission. The minister can say that they are all members of the Canadian historical association. I can tell him that there are some who are disturbed because there is no qualification whatsoever in the act today. The order in council required that members be "recognized historians". That qualification is now omitted from the act.

If it were not for the responsibility of the minister, which we would not question, of course, I would not be so happy about this thing; but there is nothing to limit an appointment which may be made to that board in the future. I do not think it is good enough. I am suggesting that the minister give that consideration and, if not in committee, at least in the very near future, the act should be amended to give recognition to this association which has done so much to preserve the history of this country, and which is so tremendously interested in this matter.

I have one other suggestion to make to the minister in connection with historic monuments. It is true, sir, that there has been an improvement in the monuments which have been erected during the past two or three years. At one time, I know, perhaps I rather hastily described them as looking like piles of nuts outside a squirrel's cage in winter time. You had this little pyramid of pebbles erected on the side of a road, which certainly should not mark any historic site. Any tourist who saw it would think that any site that was so marked was not worthy of attention in any event. That has been changed to some extent. We are now getting cut-stone monuments, which are an improvement on the old, but they still are not in keeping, I would suggest, with the historic sites which we have to preserve in this country.

At Grand Pre there is a statue to Evangeline, which was brought from France. It is a beautiful bronze statue, one which probably was fairly costly, I grant you, but

one which once seen is never forgotten. I am suggesting, sir, that perhaps there should be fewer sites marked but those which are marked should be marked much more appropriately than they are today. I say with all respect that the type of site marker which we are erecting today does not command the attention and is not worthy of the ground or the particular memorial which it is supposed to indicate. The board has a history of two or three years under the original act. We are now amending the act. We are now taking away, and I think it is an improvement, the suggestion that these men were working for a fee of some kind. That has now been abolished. Certain feelings that were aroused have certainly been assuaged by this. It is a step in the right direction.

I express my opinion that this is one of the more important pieces of legislation with which we have to deal. I am not suggesting for a moment that from the financial or pecuniary angle it is the most important, but so far as secondary bills are concerned, it is one of the more important pieces of legislation with which we have to deal. I am glad to see that the minister is proceeding with this, but I do hope that in the days that lie ahead he will use his influence to see that this board is given more and more support and provided with more and more funds so that we can carry on to a far greater degree the marking of historic sites and the erection of monuments than we have in the past. If that is not done within the next few years, then many of them will have been obliterated entirely.

Mr. G. T. Purdy (Colchester-Hants): Mr. Speaker, Scotland is famed as the land of brave men and virtuous women. New Scotland, Nova Scotia, has followed in the footsteps of old Scotland. No matter whether our forbears were highland Scots, lowland Scots, Empire Loyalists, pre-revolutionary New Englanders, Yorkshire methodists, Irish, Lunenburg Dutch, descendants from West Indian slaves, native MicMaes, or, last but far from least, the descendants from French peasants, this tradition prevails. Longfellow's Evangeline is a symbol of the last-named hardy race who were the original settlers in that portion of Nova Scotia referred to by Longfellow as in and around the basin of Minas, but naturally extending beyond those confines. I was therefore astonished to see a headline in the *Ottawa Journal* of March 1, in raised letters, reading: "Longfellow's Evangeline nonsense, eastern member of parliament tells Commons." This heading was based on the remarks of the hon. member

for Queens, as reported in *Hansard* of February 28, at page 1591, where he had this to say:

That may be a fine piece of literary work but from a historical point of view it is utter nonsense. It could not be further from the facts. I think our Canadian children should be made to realize that fact.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a very proper subheading would have been: "Eastern member of parliament attempts to sabotage Evangeline."

I wonder what the hon. member had in mind when he made these remarks. Did he seek to take away from the area in and around the basin of Minas and Cobequid bay the distinction of being known as the land of Evangeline? Can he point to one instance where Canadian children are being taught that Evangeline and the other characters in Longfellow's poem were actually people? Can it be that he wishes to show the hon. members of this house the results of the extensive reading we all know he has done, and did he follow the example of the small boy who after his father had taken him out behind the barn and told him some of the facts of life rushes out to his chums and tells them that there is no Santa Claus?

It takes a much shorter time to destroy than it does to rebuild, and I crave the indulgence of hon. members for a moment while I endeavour to restore the virtue of Evangeline. The characters in Longfellow's Evangeline did not actually exist, but there were no doubt many similar characters living on those rich Acadian lands 200 years ago who found themselves in the fall of that same year widely scattered, separated from their families with their lands and goods confiscated and their villages levelled to the ground. Evangeline is but a symbol of those people and I suggest that the historical background is far from being utter nonsense, as the hon. member suggested.

Surely he does not claim that there was not an Acadian settlement at Grand Pre as well as many other similar settlements at Pisquid, now Windsor, and other points on the shores of Minas Basin and Cobequid bay, or that these people did not suffer the fate indicated earlier. History seems to confirm that the largest assembly of Acadians for the purpose of the expulsion was not at Grand Pre but on the shores of Cobequid bay near where Truro now stands. The location of the church in which the men were imprisoned can still be found and the settlement is now called Mass Town for the very reason I have mentioned. It is also clear that when the New England planters came to take possession of the Acadian lands in this area

the only signs of habitation left were two old barns across the bay from where the church stood. Hence the name Old Barns which this area bears today.

I could go on at length to show that Longfellow's poem has a great background of historical fact but I think I have said enough to prove my point. The hon. member may not share my views and he indicates that he still has doubts, but may I say to him that I have here a booklet entitled "Canada Vacations Unlimited" which is issued under the authority of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage). It makes reference to this and surely the hon. member would not charge the minister with the responsibility of putting out a publication which contains a lot of utter nonsense.

Possibly up to this time my remarks have not followed closely the principle of the bill under discussion but I assure you that from now on I will be strictly in order. At Annapolis Royal we have reconstructed the Habitation thereby perpetuating the memory of Champlain and his "Order of the Good Time". But this reminds us of French noblemen with powdered wigs and knee breeches. What have we to keep before us the way of life of the Acadian peasants who were removed from their lands in the fall of 1755? Surely they made a great contribution to the development of Nova Scotia and I do not believe that in the areas I have mentioned previously, Grand Pre, Windsor, Mass Town, Old Barns, there is one descendant of an Acadian living on the lands formerly owned by his forefathers.

At the mouth of the Ishgonish river, Colchester county, the board has erected a monument to mark the starting point of the old Chignois crossing. This was the route by which the Acadians kept up communication with Louisburg, taking their small boats and canoes up the Ishgonish or Chignois rivers as far as possible then portaging over the hills and relaunching them in the French river, down to Northumberland straits and from there on to Louisburg.

Today near this monument power shovels, bulldozers, pile drivers and all types of modern machinery, directed by a staff of engineers with great heaps of plans and blueprints, are constructing an aboiteau to provide protection to a considerable marsh body and a crossing of the river as part of the trans-Canada highway. This activity is duplicated at many points around the Bay of Fundy. They are in most cases erecting dikes to keep the tides off the lands reclaimed from the sea by the Acadians prior to 1755, reclaimed not by modern methods as outlined above, but with the axe, the yoke of oxen and the diking

[Mr. Purdy.]

spade. With these crude tools they erected dikes and aboiteaux which stood the might of Fundy tides for generations.

Surely the way of life of these people is worthy of being kept green for the information of posterity. This year we are to be visited by descendants of the Acadians of the expulsion in order to commemorate the period 200 years ago when the cruel hand of fate descended on their forbears.

What a thrill these people would get, as well as others interested, if they could visit a reconstructed Acadian village with its church, its well, its blacksmith shop, its houses and barns. Of course it is now too late for this year, but I suggest that within the four walls of the present act such an undertaking is permissible. If not, could the scope not be extended?

I know that it would cost money, but I also feel that it would pay dividends in years to come. Located at or near the site of the Mass Town church previously referred to it would have the factual historic background of the area. This is one of the few sites of former Acadian settlements located on the route of the trans-Canada highway.

At many points around the land made famous by Longfellow's Evangeline you will still find the forest primeval with its murmuring pines and its hemlocks provided by nature and replaced by nature when man destroys. The Fundy tides go out and the Fundy tides come in, still rising as much as 60 feet in some places. The dikes built by man, destroyed by tide, time and tempest, are being replaced by man. Why should man not replace one of the Acadian villages built by man and destroyed by man of another race?

Mr. F. G. J. Hahn (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, when I began to speak on the resolution on February 25 I drew the attention of the house to a particular monument in the area which I have the honour to represent which I felt should be preserved for posterity so that at some future date history may recognize something in the far west that was worthy of preservation. I feel that the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) was right when he referred to the monument of Evangeline and that it be recognized. The hon. member said that it was more important to preserve historic sites than to erect monuments. In this instance I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that I am not asking for the erection of a monument. The monument has been established for some time and I simply ask that it be preserved as a historic site.

On June 15, 1846, the treaty of Washington was signed. This treaty defined the boundary

between the United States and Canada as being a continuation of the 49th degree of parallel on into the gulf of Georgia and then to the strait of Juan de Fuca. There are certain historical incidents which have some romantic backgrounds and in this connection it is interesting to note that no less a personage than Kaiser Bill of considerable fame settled this particular controversy.

Some 15 years after the treaty of Washington was formally signed a monument was erected in commemoration in 1861 by the government of that day. At the present time the site of that monument is half on United States territory with the other half being on a farm belonging to a farmer in British Columbia. This gentleman has seen fit to offer it to our government from time to time but the government has possibly never considered it to be sufficiently significant historically, to make it one of our historic sites. However, I wish to draw to the minister's attention that the people of the United States feel differently about their half. They have set aside seven or eight acres and are preparing a park area in that region to commemorate a treaty of long standing between the two nations. I would strongly urge our minister to seriously consider doing likewise in this instance.

I have here an article from the Vancouver Sun of September 6, 1952. I am not going to read the entire article because it is quite lengthy, but parts of it do describe the monument much more vividly possibly than I would be capable of doing, and I shall read from this article about the historical significance of the monument itself. Part way down the first column the article says:

But, somehow, the Canadian government has officially forgotten all about the monument.

"I've written to them, and I've written to them about it," Jordan says—

Mr. Jordan is the gentleman who owns the land—

—"and still, they won't acknowledge there's any monument here. But the tax collector in Ladner sure knows about it. He charges me for it in my assessment."

This monument is a fair size; it has a 22-foot shaft with a needle-like projection and the names of those who were responsible for the signing of the treaty appear on one side. I might also point out it is one of the few monuments that stand on the border between the two nations. It is possibly the least known of all our monuments. I quote from the article again:

The needle-like monument bears the names of the border commissioners on the south and north side. The American side contains the name of Archibald Campbell, the U.S. commissioner, and

on the north side, Capt. J. Prevost, R.N., Capt. C. H. Richards, R.N., and Lt.-Col. J. S. Hawkins, R.E., "H.B.M. Commssrs."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member but may I point out that we are discussing the principle of the bill on second reading. I observe that that part of the principle is an amendment to the phrase "historic place", but I do believe that we would be extending the debate entirely too far if we allowed at this time a description of various monuments of which there are a great many in Canada. I therefore think that the debate at this stage should be limited to a general debate and that so far as possible, except for the purposes of illustration of the principle, we should refrain from referring to descriptions of particular monuments.

Mr. Hahn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate your ruling in this instance. I was merely referring to the article because I believe that very few people in Canada are familiar with the historical significance of this particular monument and because the monument depicts the history of its day on the west coast. I think it is sufficiently important that the hon. members should be somewhat familiar with the historical aspects of it. I shall bow to your ruling and confine my remarks to statements of a more general nature.

The monument of Evangeline was very romantic in its own right in so far as it tells a love story of an individual. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this monument too has a romance of its own. It tells a different story, of course, a story of a much more shady nature. It tells a great deal about the instances of smuggling which took place between the United States and Canada at that time.

An hon. Member: That is worth remembering.

Mr. Hahn: No; I would not say that we should necessarily remember that particular part of Canadian history, but it is a part of our history. The monument in itself had nothing to do with the shady part of our history but it is located in an area that possibly lent itself to some of this shady business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage) is going to be in that area, or in the lower mainland, on May 8, 9 and 10. I have only one request to make of him at this time. I hope that while he is in the area he will make a point of availing himself of some transportation—and if he finds that inconvenient I shall be only too happy to transport

him to the area—so that he might see the area for himself and perhaps be persuaded to set aside a few acres to commemorate this site as the American government has seen fit to do.

In three years' time we will celebrate our centennial in British Columbia and it would give me a great deal of pleasure indeed if at that time I were able to give credit to the present minister and be able to tell the people that this would not have come about except for the minister's foresight in seeing that this monument is preserved for posterity.

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) in the tribute he paid to the members of the historic sites and monuments board for the work they have done in preserving historic sites and more particularly in marking them across Canada. The board has been hampered in carrying out that work by limited funds and by the policy laid down by the government under which they have had to operate. I am quite glad to see this bill for this reason in particular, that it changes the definition of a historical building and makes it possible—I think it was quite possible before, actually, but the amendment in the bill makes it certain—to acquire or to mark a building which is of national historical importance because of its age or type of architecture or anything else of that nature.

It seems to me that the policy which we have followed in regard to our historic sites has been a most imprudent one. In this country we have allowed a historic building, a fort or a house or whatever it might be, to fall completely into disrepair and the rubble that was left was in many cases carried away so there was practically nothing left to show that a historic building had been there. Then many years later we would erect a cairn and put a plaque on it to indicate it was a historic site. As the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings said, people driving along the highway see a small cairn of that sort and they are past it in most cases before they are in a position to stop and look at it. Another disadvantage is that there is nothing beyond the cairn to attract their attention which would make them think it is worth while stopping. It seems to me the policy we should follow is to prevent our historical buildings from falling into ruin.

I would hope that the historic sites and monuments board might be given a different policy. I am quite sure they would be only too happy to take part in the work of preservation and restoration of some of the historic buildings existing in this country

[Mr. Hahn.]

which are rapidly disappearing at the present time. There are numerous examples of that sort of thing. There is one not very far from Ottawa. I refer to what is known as Langton house at Fenelon falls which was built shortly after 1800. It is of particular interest because there happens to exist an itemized account of what practically every board and fitting in the house cost. I believe it is the only house of its kind in the English-speaking part of Canada. I do not know about the French-speaking part of Canada. The house is falling rapidly into decay at the present time. In three or four years it will be gone and its considerable value as a historical building, arising from the detailed accounts that exist regarding it, will completely disappear.

I make a plea to the government to change their policy with respect to historical buildings in particular and to adopt a policy of acquiring and preserving such buildings. In many cases it is not necessary for the government to pay any money to secure them because the people or societies involved will be glad to turn them over to the government. In some cases, such as the building I cited, they are waiting to be taken so that something can be done with them. As far as restoration is concerned, I think the amount of money which might be employed in that way would not materially affect the general balance of payments, and it is the type of expenditure which the people of this country will not only be willing to have made at this time but which our children and grandchildren will be extremely glad we were farsighted enough to make.

Mr. J. M. Forgie (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, like all hon. members, I support the bill. In my section of the country, the Ottawa valley, we have the Ottawa valley historical association which also includes the county of Pontiac on the Quebec side of the Ottawa river. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Winters) has just recently, by his persistent efforts, completed negotiations for the construction of the Allumette bridge connecting the provinces of Quebec and Ontario in the Ottawa valley. Mid-stream in the river lies an island of about 450 acres known as Morrison's Island. Because of the projected construction of the bridge the island is now becoming more important, and it is the intention of the historical society to ask the directors of the historic sites and monuments board of Canada, which has been doing a most commendable job on a small amount of money, to consider, if deemed advisable,

the acquiring of Morrison's island as a historical site. The society will receive the support of all sections of our community in this application.

It was on this island in the 17th century that Samuel de Champlain and his companion, Nicolas de Vignau, bivouacked for some time on their journey westward in search of what was believed to be Cathay, now known as China. Champlain bivouacked on the island for security reasons because off the northern shore of the island there is fast, white, running water and off the southern shore there are what are known as the Lost Chenail rapids which no man, as far as we know, has ever attempted to run and survived.

The leader of the Algonquin tribe, chief Tessouat, took Samuel de Champlain to this island to safeguard him from the enemy tribes. History reveals that while Champlain was on the island he was impressed with the extensive cemetery of the savages with its sepulchres and shrines, and it is believed that on this island a rich find awaits the archaeologist, possibly a lost Algonquin village which would rival in national importance the Fort Ste. Marie site near Midland. It would be a pity indeed if the island were sacrificed for commercial reasons. At the proper time we hope to bring this matter to the attention of the board of directors in an effort to have the island pinpointed as a memorial site.

Mr. H. J. Robichaud (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the passing of the bill by getting involved in a long debate, and I can assure the house I will be very brief. However, I want to congratulate the minister on introducing these amendments to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Historic Sites and Monuments Act. I want to refer to certain remarks made in the house by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. MacLean) when speaking on second reading of the bill on February 28 last. These remarks have also been referred to tonight by the hon. member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Purdy).

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the poem, "Evangeline", cannot be regarded as a historical document and no one has ever insisted that it be regarded as such. It is obvious that the poet used his imagination in the details of what he called, to use his own words, "The Tale of Acadie". I have read over and over again the poem in question, the text of which I have before me at this moment. From my own judgment, far from calling this literary work "utter nonsense", I cannot but admire the American

poet for his literary efforts based on an historical fact which no well-thinking Canadian can deny.

I can assure my hon. friend, and I regret his absence from the house this evening, that at no time will I hesitate to recommend the reading of Longfellow's poem "Evangeline" to any one of my eight children. To Acadians the name "Evangeline" is one of tribute to a memorable page of Acadian history, a page which ended in happiness and success. The name Evangeline has been adopted for our French language daily newspaper, *L'Evangeline*, published at Moncton, and has been recognized for generations as a name of tradition and romance not only by Acadians but by the great majority of our Canadian population, and even in a number of foreign countries.

Il me semble, monsieur l'Orateur, que le député de Queens (M. MacLean), qui est reconnu pour aimer la lecture et qui se plaît à puiser ses sources de renseignements dans les volumes historiques, chaque fois que l'occasion lui est offerte, devrait se bien garder de traiter de non-sens et de fausseté une tradition basée sur une page de notre histoire. Le poème de Longfellow *Evangeline* ne tend pas à raconter dans tous ses détails, et avec l'exactitude d'un historien, l'une des pages mémorables de notre histoire, au contraire, l'auteur ne fait que rappeler, en s'aidant de son imagination de poète l'un des incidents relatifs à un événement qui est lui-même commémoré par un monument historique, connu sous le nom de *Puits d'Evangeline*, à Grand Pré. Le député de Queens devrait reconnaître qu'à cette occasion rien n'a été négligé pour ériger un monument, de la façon la plus artistique et la plus réaliste possible, dans un coin de notre pays connu sous le nom de "pays d'Evangeline".

Je me permets, monsieur l'Orateur, de rappeler à la Chambre, que le poème de Longfellow, *Evangeline*, est reconnu dans le programme d'enseignement approuvé par le ministère de l'Éducation de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick, dont la pratique n'est certes pas de permettre l'enseignement à nos enfants de faits qui ne tiennent pas debout et pourraient les induire en erreur. J'ai ici le premier volume des œuvres poétiques de Longfellow, dans lequel on retrouve le poème *Evangeline*. Je regrette ne pouvoir y relever aucun de ces faits "qui pourraient nous induire en erreur et qui ne tiennent pas debout". S'agirait-il, par exemple, des événements qui y sont relatés, tels que la dispersion, les misères, les recherches? Est-ce que ce serait, par hasard, cette partie qui

décrit les Acadiens comme un peuple paisible et heureux? Peut-être l'honorable député ferait-il bien de satisfaire sa curiosité et de se rafraîchir la mémoire en consultant les œuvres de l'historien canadien, le Dr J. Clarence Webster, qu'il a lui-même cité.

Toute la population acadienne serait honorée si l'honorable ministre du Nord canadien et des Ressources nationales (M. Lesage) pouvait se rendre, cette année, au pays d'Évangéline et se joindre à nous lors des célébrations à l'occasion du 2^e centenaire de la déportation de 1755.

Je profite de la circonstance pour lui transmettre l'invitation au nom de la population acadienne tout entière.

Mr. H. J. Murphy (Westmorland): I wish to take part in this debate and join with my colleagues from New Brunswick, the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Robichaud) and the hon. member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Purdy), in making a few remarks that arise out of the statement made by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. MacLean). This statement is reported in *Hansard* for February 28 at page 1591, and reads as follows:

In that connection, we should not be misled by such fanciful literary efforts as the poem *Évangéline*. That may be a fine piece of literary work but, from a historical point of view, it is utter nonsense. It could not be further from the facts. I think our Canadian children should be made to realize that fact.

This statement, made this year which is the bicentennial anniversary of the expulsion of the Acadians of Grand Pré, comes as a distinct shock to us in the Moncton-Westmorland area. The city of Moncton will be the centre of a reunion of the Acadians this year. It is expected that many tourists from the United States of Acadian descent living in Louisiana and elsewhere will journey to Moncton to take part in the bicentennial.

This winter over 100 Acadians from our district journeyed to Louisiana and attended the festivities marking the opening of the celebration of the bicentennial of the expulsion of the Acadians. At St. Martinville they visited the burial place of Emeline Labiche who, according to the stories handed down through the generations, was supposed to have been the real *Évangéline*. No one expects the details of the poem to be factual, but the background material upon which the poem is based is historical. This literary work has, through the years, been the spiritual cause for binding the Acadian people together, and *Évangéline* has been the symbol of their social, religious and material progress through the last two centuries.

Mr. Harkness: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is the third speech we have [Mr. Robichaud.]

had read here tonight on this same subject. I think if anyone, the present speaker or anyone else, is going to speak on this subject, he should not read his speech.

Mr. Murphy (Westmorland): I am not reading my speech. I am referring from time to time to my notes, as many members of the opposition have done. It would seem to me that more speeches are read from the other side of the house than from this side of the house, although we are too polite to say so.

Mr. Fleming: Nonsense.

Mr. Murphy (Westmorland): The bicentennial celebrations are not meant to mark the hardships suffered by the Acadian people nor the differences in this land of ours at that time, but are festivities marking the march of progress by these people from their status at that time to the proud race that comprises a large proportion of our population in New Brunswick, who have contributed so much to the advancement of our communities.

I have the pleasure of representing in this house a constituency made up of a substantial number of people of Acadian descent. The visitors to Westmorland county this year will hear the songs of old Acadia, will hear the singing of *Évangéline*, and if they pursue their visit to Nova Scotia will see the statue of *Évangéline* standing on a piece of land granted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Acadians for perpetuating the historical facts of the expulsion of the Acadians. I consider the statement made by the hon. member for Queens an insult to the 270,000 people of Acadian descent—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member but it seems to me we are getting away from the subject matter of the bill. Great latitude has been taken in this debate. I know that attempts have been made from time to time to keep members within the ambit of the principle of this bill, which I do not think offers the scope which would allow members to speak in the manner they have. I have been listening attentively to the hon. member and much of his speech is a repetition of the speech we have just heard. I am sure the hon. member knows that according to Standing Order No. 40, paragraph 2, he should not repeat his own arguments or the arguments used by others in the same debate. I hope, therefore, he will not repeat arguments that have already been used.

Mr. Murphy (Westmorland): I had just about concluded my remarks, which were meant to show that this statement concerning an historic site made by the hon. member

for Queens was not in accordance with the facts. I had no way of knowing, since I have been attending committees all day, who was going to speak or what they would say. In closing, I wish to say that this remark is a reflection on the 15,000 Acadians in Prince Edward Island, as well as the 270,000 in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 1—*Historic place.*

Mr. Herridge: I shall be very brief, Mr. Chairman. I am very glad to see this definition of historic sites, because it will remove a lot of ambiguity that has occurred in the past. I rise to say that I cannot agree with the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings that pure historic monuments should be erected. I feel the board should continue marking sites that require marking. I cannot agree with his suggestion that the present monuments are not appealing to the eye or satisfactory. I think they are of good design, excellent structure and size, and are witnesses to some historical event of the past.

Mr. Nowlan: On the matter of monuments, as to their taste, I have expressed my views on that and I am not going to quarrel with the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge). I do agree with him, and I am glad to see that this definition of historic sites is a national thing. I think that is something the minister should keep in mind. In my own province the provincial government has purchased and has developed sites of provincial significance. I hope the minister will see that matters of provincial interest will be developed by the provinces only and that sites of national importance will be looked after by this board.

Apparently it does not do to indulge in a sense of humour in this chamber. We have heard tonight a number of serious speeches, all of which, as the hon. member for Broadview has said, were apparently written by the one party—

An hon. Member: Are you sure of that?

Mr. Nowlan:—and all aimed at the hon. member for Queens. I feel that any historian will agree with what he said, that there are some errors in that literary work. After all, however, I am not one to quarrel with that because it has been one of the greatest forms of publicity for my constituency.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, section 1 emphasizes the inclusion of buildings or structures that are of national interest by reason of age or architectural design. I would say briefly that it seems to me there has been a tendency to emphasize more recently—

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act respecting The London and Port Stanley Railway Company and the corporation of the city of London.

An act respecting The Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Company, Limited.

An act to implement an agreement between Canada and Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax.

An act to implement an agreement between Canada and Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to succession duty.

An act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

An act to amend the Canada Grain Act.

An act to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act, 1952.

An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1956.

An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1955.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Harris: Tomorrow, as has already been announced, we shall continue the debate on external affairs, and if it is concluded we shall continue the debate on the motion to go into supply with, I take it, unanimous consent that we can do it on Friday.

It being ten minutes past ten o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

The following is the English translation of remarks made in French
on the date indicated.

Thursday, March 31, 1955

(Page 2596)

Mr. Fraser (St. John's East):

Mr. Speaker, Signal Hill is hallowed by the blood of the brave men of both races who fell in this fierce encounter.

* * *

(Page 2603)

Mr. H. J. Robichaud (Gloucester):

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Queens (Mr. MacLean) whose fondness for books is well known and who likes looking for information in historical works whenever he has an opportunity of doing so, should know better than to say that a tradition based on an event in our history is nonsense and contrary to fact. Longfellow's poem "Evangeline" is not of course an attempt to narrate in detail and with historical accuracy one of the memorable events of our history. On the contrary the author merely uses his imagination to remind us of one of the incidents relating to an event which is itself commemorated by a historical monument known as Evangeline's well, in Grand-Pré. The member for Queens should recognize that, in this instance no effort was spared in putting up a monument as artistic and as realistic as possible in a corner of the country known as "the land of Evangeline".

May I remind the house, Mr. Speaker, that Longfellow's poem "Evangeline" is recognized in the schools curriculum approved by the New Brunswick Department of Education, which is certainly not in the habit of allowing our children to be taught facts which do not stand up and which could mislead them. I have here the first volume of the poetical works of Longfellow, containing the poem "Evangeline". I regret being unable to find in it any of these facts "which could mislead us and which do not stand up". Could they be, for instance, the events described, such as the deportation, the hardships, the searches? Could it, perchance, be the part that describes the Acadians as a peace-loving and happy people? The hon. member might be well-advised to satisfy his curiosity and to refresh his memory by consulting the works of the Canadian historian, Dr. J. Clarence Webster, whom he himself quoted.

The whole Acadian people would be honoured if, this year the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage) could come to the land of Evangeline and join us in the celebrations to commemorate the bicentenary of the 1755 deportation.

I take advantage of this opportunity to invite him on behalf of the whole Acadian people.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

The daily edition is issued on the morning following each day's sitting, the speeches being reported in the language in which they were delivered. Speeches in French are translated into English and appear in that form as an appendix to the daily issue. Speeches in English are translated and appear in the French edition the day following delivery.

Following publication of the daily edition, proofs of their speeches or remarks are sent to members. These must be returned to the debates office within *eight calendar days* of the date on which the speech was made. Suggested changes must be confined to *correction of errors and essential minor alterations*.

Reprints of speeches are furnished if order is given within *seven days* of the date of the daily edition in which the speech appeared. Order through debates office (local 3197).

An index is issued as soon as practicable after the close of the session. Index cards for the current session may be consulted at room 159, west block. For index inquiries, telephone local 8981.

Extra copies of the daily edition will be supplied at 5 cents each or \$3.75 a hundred, provided the order is placed with the joint parliamentary distribution office (local 4637), before 10 o'clock p.m. on the day the debates took place; or directly with the printing bureau (local 2678) before 12 o'clock midnight. Otherwise, orders for reprints will be accepted at a cost of approximately 10 cents per copy.

For information as to mailing lists, telephone distribution office.

Hansard is available to the public by subscription. The rate for the session is \$3. Remittance must accompany order, and should be sent to the queen's printer, Ottawa.

T. S. HUBBARD

Editor of Debates, room 324
(Telephone, local 3197)

W. W. BUSKARD

Associate Editor, room 325
(Telephone, local 3197)

COMPTE RENDU OFFICIEL DES DÉBATS

L'édition quotidienne, publiée dans le texte original, paraît le lendemain matin de chaque séance. La version anglaise des discours prononcés en français est publiée en annexe à l'édition quotidienne du texte original. Les discours prononcés en anglais paraissent en traduction dans l'édition française, le lendemain de la séance.

Après la publication de l'édition quotidienne, des épreuves de leurs discours ou de leurs remarques sont communiquées aux députés. Ils doivent renvoyer ces épreuves au bureau des débats *au plus tard huit jours pleins* après la date à laquelle le discours a été prononcé. Les changements proposés *doivent porter uniquement sur les erreurs et ne comporter que les petites modifications absolument indispensables*.

Pour les tirages à part de tout discours, la commande doit parvenir au bureau des débats (tél. 2360) au cours des *sept jours* qui suivent sa publication.

L'index paraît aussitôt que possible après la fin de la session. On peut en consulter les fiches pour la présente session au bureau des débats. Pour tous renseignements à ce sujet, prière de téléphoner à ce bureau (tél. 7645).

Des exemplaires additionnels des livraisons quotidiennes sont disponibles à raison de 5 cents l'unité ou \$3.75 le cent, à condition que les commandes parviennent au Bureau de distribution parlementaire mixte (tél. 4637), le jour même où les débats eurent lieu, avant 10 hrs. p.m. ou directement à l'imprimerie nationale (tél. 2678) avant minuit. Les commandes placées à partir de minuit sont acceptées au coût de réimpression, soit environ 10 cents l'unité.

Ce même bureau fournira tous les renseignements relatifs aux listes d'expédition.

Toute personne qui le désire peut s'abonner aux débats de la chambre des communes en adressant, à l'imprimeur de la reine, à Ottawa, une demande accompagnée du prix de l'abonnement qui est de \$3 pour chaque session.

L'éditeur des Débats français

PAUL FRENETTE

Bureau 318A (téléphone 2360)

L'éditeur adjoint

ANDRÉ NAUBERT

Bureau 318A (téléphone 2360)

QUESTION

1. By provinces, how much has been paid to institutions of higher learning under Vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 Estimates?
2. By provinces, what were the number of students deemed eligible for calculation in connection with Vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 Estimates?

2. What action, in detail, was taken as a result of his findings in each case, and when?

3. What action, in each case, was taken following the submission of the Currie Report, and when?

4. Were any changes in personnel made as a result of these findings and actions, and if so, what changes?

5. After the actions and changes referred to in parts 2, 3 and 4 were taken or made, if any, what further or continuing investigations were made with respect to the administration of this Company, and when?

6. What were the results or findings in each case?

No. 36—*Mr. Hahn*

March 23—1. How many letter carriers were employed during each of the past five years?

2. During each of these years, how many (a) letter carrier uniforms; (b) summer weight tunics; (c) summer weight trousers; (d) winter weight trousers; (e) summer weight shirts; (f) winter weight shirts; (g) caps, were issued?

3. Who were the five chief suppliers of (a) summer weight trousers; (b) winter weight trousers, during each of the past five years?

4. What was the total cost of outfitting the carriers during each of the abovementioned years?

5. What was the total cost for summer weight trousers for each year?

No. 37—*Mr. Bryce*

March 24—1. Is a research being conducted by any agency of the government into the relative food value of butter as compared to margarine? If so, what has been the result of such research?

2. What quantity of edible oils was imported into Canada in each of the following years: 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

3. What quantity of such imported edible oils was used in the production of margarine in each of the abovementioned years?

4. What was the quantity of margarine produced in Canada in each of the following years: 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

5. What quantity of (a) margarine; (b) butter, was consumed in Canada in the years: 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

No. 38—*Mr. Proudfoot*

March 24—1. How many patients were admitted to Canadian mental institutions in 1943 and 1953?

2. What are the ratios of the numbers of these admissions to the number of persons in Canada?

No. 39—*Mr. Proudfoot*

March 24—1. How many patients were residing in Canadian mental institutions at the end of the calendar years 1943 and 1953?

2. What are the ratios of the numbers of these residents to the number of persons in Canada?

No. 40—*Mr. Fraser (Peterborough)*

March 24—1. Has Canada sold and shipped any food or food products to any of the satellite countries in (a) 1952; (b) 1953; (c) 1954?

2. Have any of the satellite countries sold and shipped to Canada food or food products in (a) 1952; (b) 1953; (c) 1954?

3. If so, what inspection has been made by the Canadian authorities to see that these imports of food are pure and in a sanitary condition?

No. 41—*Mr. Proudfoot*

March 24—1. What was the average per diem cost of caring for and treating patients in Canadian mental institutions in 1943 and 1953?

2. What were the corresponding costs for patients in tuberculosis sanatoria and in public general hospitals, during each of these years?

No. 42—*Mr. Knowles*

March 24—1. Have arrangements yet been made for stationary engineers and firemen employed by the Federal Government to be put on the five-day 40-hour week?

2. If not, will such arrangements be made soon?

No. 43—*Mr. Balcom*

March 24—1. What was the total sum paid each province in 1954 under the Massey Grants recommendations?

2. What were the number of students attending universities in each province for the year 1954?

No. 44—*Mr. Goode*

March 25—1. How many automobiles have been purchased for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Nelson, British Columbia, in 1954, 1955?

2. Were these purchased subject to tender?

3. If so, what firms tendered and what were the tender prices submitted to the Government?

No. 45—*Mr. Goode*

March 25—What are the true facts in regard to radioactive fall out in connection with the Nevada bomb tests?

No. 46—*Mr. Johnson (Kindersley)*

March 25—1. Is Canada supplying goods intended to aid in the rehabilitation of Korea?

2. If so, under what program or programs is such aid supplied?

3. What is the value of goods shipped for such purpose by calendar years since the beginning of the Korean war?

4. Is the government considering substantially increasing its economic assistance to aid in Korean rehabilitation?

Many thanks

ACADIA UNIVERSITY
WOLFVILLE, N. S.

May 4, 1955.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Dear Colonel Balcom, -

Many thanks for the offprint from
Hansard with its welcome assurance (pp. 2968-2971) that
you were "in there pitching" for the universities of Nova Scotia.
We are appreciative.

Yours sincerely,
Watson Kirkconnell.

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES

NOVA SCOTIA

	<u>Amount of Grant</u>
St. Francis Xavier University	\$86,682.40
College Sainte-Anne	5,888.75
Dalhousie University (including King's College and Maritime College of Pharmacy)	115,049.35
Maritime School of Social Work	1,716.15
Mount Saint Vincent College	19,685.25
Nova Scotia Technical College	16,286.60
Pine Hill Divinity Hall	4,340.85
Sacred Heart Convent	1,211.40
St. Mary's University	21,636.95
Nova Scotia Agricultural College	5,451.30
Acadia University	49,936.60
Holy Heart Seminary	8,614.40

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS

	<u>Payments to eligible institutions</u>	<u>Number of eligible students</u>	<u>Payment per student</u>
British Columbia	\$ 633,000	6,005	105.41
Manitoba	414,000	4,171	99.26
New Brunswick	273,500	2,231	122.59
Alberta	519,500	3,297	157.57
Saskatchewan	439,000	2,694	162.96
Ontario	2,523,000	17,896	140.98
Prince Edward Island	52,500	245	214.29
Newfoundland	199,000	505	394.06
Nova Scotia	336,500	3,948	85.23

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS

	<u>Payments to eligible institutions</u>	<u>Number of eligible students</u>	<u>Payment per student</u>
British Columbia	\$ 633,000	6,005	105.41
Manitoba	414,000	4,171	99.26
New Brunswick	273,500	2,231	122.59
Alberta	519,500	3,297	157.57
Saskatchewan	439,000	2,694	162.96
Ontario	2,523,000	17,896	140.98
Prince Edward Island	52,500	245	214.29
Newfoundland	199,000	505	394.06
Nova Scotia	336,500	3,948	85.23

O t t a w a,
June 22, 1955.

Dear Mr. Harris,

Vote # 119, 1954-55 Estimates
Massey Grants to Universities

May I have the amount of the payments to
each of the universities in the Maritime Provinces
paid through the fund voted in the 1954-55 Estimates.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

S. R. Balcom, M.P.
Halifax - Dartmouth
Canada's Eastern Gateway
to World Markets.

SRB:mw

Hon. W. E. Harris,
Minister of Finance,
O t t a w a.

RCM/ML

SRB - thought you
might like to
have this.
But don't
lose it. *mw*

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

No. - Mr. Balcom

- Question:
1. By provinces, how much has been paid to the institutions of higher learning under Vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 estimates?
 2. By provinces, what were the number of students deemed eligible for calculation in connection with vote No. 119 in the 1954-55 estimates?

Answer:

	(1) Payments to eligible <u>institutions</u>	(2) Number of eligible <u>students</u>
Newfoundland	\$ 199,000	505
Prince Edward Island	52,500	245
Nova Scotia	336,500	3,948
New Brunswick	273,500	2,231
Quebec	-	-
Ontario	2,523,000	17,896
Manitoba	414,000	4,171
Saskatchewan	439,000	2,694
Alberta	519,500	3,297
British Columbia	633,000	6,005

Ottawa, March 30, 1955.

Q U E S T I O N

Under the Massey Grant Recommendations, what payment was made per university student for each province in

(a) 1953-54

(b) 1954-55 to date

Ottawa
March 17, 1955

M. A. Hardie, M.P.
North-West Territories