

HOUSE OF COMMONS

NOTICE OF MOTION

By MR. BALCOM On WEDNESDAY next

INQUIRY OF MINISTRY

No. DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

What was the amount, and the dollar value of the catch of (a) mackerel; (b) herring, in the year 1954, for (i) Nova Scotia; (ii) Newfoundland?

The following figures are preliminary. "Herring" refers to mature herring, i.e. excludes "sardines".

(i) Nova Scotia

	Quantity '000 lb.	Value \$'000
Mackerel	12,598	498
Herring	29,089	391

(ii) Newfoundland

	Quantity '000 lb.	Value \$'000
Mackerel	2,029	95
Herring	34,103	309

Brie
 I asked this question
 as it was alleged to
 me by some Halifax fish merchants
 that quantity and value of
 the Newfie catch in these 2 fish
 could not be obtained
 S. B.
 Thanks
 G. R. P.

Q U E S T I O N

S.R. Balcom
Member for Halifax

What was the amount, and the dollar value, of the
catch of

(a) mackerel

(b) herring

in the year 1954 for

(I) Nova Scotia

(II) Newfoundland?

Ottawa
Mar. 28/55

.....

Would it be in order to ask
a question re the fisheries of Newfoundland
such as this:

What was the amount and the
dollar value of the Mackerel and of the Herring
in the year 1954 and the same question would be
asked about Nova Scotia.

C. L. Jones

O t t a w a,
March 30, 1955.

Dear Alistair,

Would it be possible for you to advise me the amount, and the dollar value, of the catch of (a) Mackerel and (b) herring in the year 1954 for Nova Scotia and also for Newfoundland.

Yours sincerely,

S. R. Balcom,
Member for Halifax.

/mw

7067 3366
4544
Mr. Alistair Fraser,
Exec. Asst to Minister of Fisheries,
O t t a w a.

What should MW do with this?

write -
ask for fresh
ask for my
the and etc to.

Blake

Sept

nat def
2994

Wrote Chesley

re Beaverbank
Proped

Index 40-19-2-12

~~Handwritten notes and scribbles, including a large diagonal line crossing through the page.~~

Q U E S T I O N

S.R.Balcom
Member for Halifax

What was the amount, and the dollar value of the
catch of

- (a) mackerel
- (b) herring

in the year 1954 for

- (I) Nova Scotia
- (II) Newfoundland?

Ottawa
May 2, 1955

.....

Q U E S T I O N

S.R. Balcom
Member for Halifax

*Monthly
Meeting*

What was the amount, and the dollar value, of the
catch of

(a) mackerel

(b) herring

in the year 1954 for

(I) Nova Scotia

(II) Newfoundland?

Ottawa
Mar. 28/55

S. R. Balcom
.....

COMPLIMENTS
Sam. Balcom, M. P.
HALIFAX, N. S.

Volume 97
Number 77

2nd Session
22nd Parliament



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, May 4, 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.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 4, 1955	
Answers to Questions Asked by: Mr. McCulloch (Pictou), Mr. Pommer, Mr. Follwell, Mr. Yuill, Mr. Balcom.....	3433
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns: Mr. Nowlan, Mr. Zaplitny.....	3434
Motions for Papers. Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain), Mr. Dinsdale.....	3434
External Affairs. Indo-China—Measures taken to protect Canadian personnel. Mr. Nesbitt, Mr. Martin.....	3434
National Capital Plan. Suggested setting up of committee to study Ottawa planning. Mr. Coldwell, Mr. St. Laurent.....	3435
Grain. Request for final payment on 1954-55 pool. Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. Winters.....	3435
Water Pollution. Bedford basin—Inquiry as to contamination from garbage disposal. Mr. Balcom, Mr. Langlois (Gaspé).....	3435
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Suggested reference of items in estimates to committee. Mr. Fleming, Mr. McCann.....	3435
Atomic Energy. Suggested study by committee of radioactive fall-out. Mr. Knowles, Mr. St. Laurent.....	3436
The Budget. Annual financial statement of the Minister of Finance. Consideration resumed of motion of Mr. Harris for committee of ways and means; amendment, Mr. Macdonnell..	3436
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Drew.....	3436
Mr. Martin.....	3446
Mr. Garson.....	3453
Mr. Argue.....	3456
Debate adjourned on motion of Mr. Hamilton (York West).....	3461
Business of the House	3461
Royal Assent given by the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General.....	3461
Appendix. Alphabetical list of members with their constituencies, addresses, and political affiliations.	

Wednesday, May 4, 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, May 4, 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 today, May 4, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. F. Delaute,
Secretary to the Governor General
(Administrative)

QUESTIONS

C.N.R. DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. McCulloch (Pictou):

1. How many diesel locomotives are operated by Canadian National Railways and subsidiaries in Canada?

2. How many are operated in each province?

Mr. Langlois (Gaspé):

The Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. On April 28, 1955—580 diesel units.

2. Locomotives are not permanently assigned to any particular region or province in which the railway operates but on the contrary are moved within the system from time to time as traffic requires, except that 12 diesel units are permanently assigned to Newfoundland and 19 to Prince Edward Island.

PRICE SUPPORT OF GOLD MINING, 1954

Mr. Yuill:

What was the total amount paid in price support of gold mining industry in 1954?

Mr. Prudham: Assistance paid by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys during the calendar year 1954 amounted to \$14,879,334.33..

PRICE SUPPORT OF FARM COMMODITIES, 1954

Mr. Yuill:

What was the total amount paid for price support on all farm commodities in 1954?

77—1955—1½

Mr. McCubbin: The estimated net cost of operations of the agricultural prices support board during the 1954-55 fiscal year ending March 31, 1955, is \$3,210,928.

FISHERIES STATISTICS

Mr. Balcom:

What was the amount, and the dollar value of the catch of (a) mackerel; (b) herring, in the year 1954, for (i) Nova Scotia; (ii) Newfoundland?

Mr. MacNaught: The following figures are preliminary. "Herring" refers to mature herring, i.e. excludes "sardines".

(i) Nova Scotia:

	Quantity	Value
	'000 lb.	\$'000
Mackerel	12,598	498
Herring	29,089	391

(ii) Newfoundland:

	Quantity	Value
	'000 lb.	\$'000
Mackerel	2,029	95
Herring	34,103	309

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Mr. Follwell:

1. What has been the total cost to the federal government of the trans-Canada highway?

2. How much has been spent by the federal government in each province?

3. How much has been spent by each province?

4. How many miles have been completed on the trans-Canada Highway?

5. How many miles have been completed in each province?

6. How many miles are now under construction in each province?

7. When will the trans-Canada highway be completed?

Mr. Bourget:

1. \$63,401,393.75 to April 23, 1955.

2.

Newfoundland\$ 5,478,732.60

Prince Edward Island 1,097,615.10

Nova Scotia 75,699.97

New Brunswick 2,438,880.81

Ontario 19,111,517.62

Manitoba 5,578,066.97

Saskatchewan 7,051,790.94

Alberta 8,187,333.98

British Columbia 14,381,755.76

3. The above amounts are one-half the cost of construction as represented by claims submitted and paid. We have no records of the total amounts spent to date by the provincial governments.

4. 1,068.2 miles paved to March 31, 1955.

5.

Newfoundland	Nil
Prince Edward Island	46.1
Nova Scotia	4.0
New Brunswick	52.2
Ontario	314.8
Manitoba	130.1
Saskatchewan	230.4
Alberta	150.9
British Columbia	139.7

6.

	Grading	Paving
Newfoundland	113.9	Nil
Prince Edward Island	0.3	2.1
Nova Scotia	14.1	11.7
New Brunswick	9.1	8.3
Ontario	30.2	23.1
Manitoba	19.6	5.6
Saskatchewan	35.4	36.0
Alberta	17.9	21.4
British Columbia	24.2	30.1

7. The trans-Canada highway agreements expire on December 9, 1956.

WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCES, WINNIPEG DISTRICT

Mr. Pommer:

1. How many veterans and widows in the Winnipeg district of the Department of Veterans Affairs were receiving war veterans allowance at January 31, 1955?

2. Of these, how many have received an award from the assistance fund, war veterans allowance, during the period from April 1, 1954 to January 31, 1955?

3. Of the number given in answer to part II, how many were receiving a monthly grant at January 31, 1955?

Mr. Robertson:

1. Veterans: 2,743; widows: 934.
2. Veterans: 265; widows: 130.
3. Veterans: 115; widows: 80.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

NATIONAL PARKS, MARITIME PROVINCES —TOURIST FACILITIES

Mr. Nowlan:

1. Are there cabins, lodges, restaurants, canteens or other facilities for tourists in any of the national parks in the maritime provinces?

2. If so, (a) In which of such parks are such facilities provided or established? (b) By whom were they provided or established, and in what year or years? (c) Which of such facilities are operated by the dominion government or any agency thereof, and which are operated by lease or concession? (d) Of those which are operated by lease or concession, what are the terms and conditions thereof?

Mr. Lesage: Return tabled.

[Mr. Bourget.]

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS, C.N.R.—T.C.A. —RENUMERATION

Mr. Zaplitny:

What remuneration, expenses or other emolument was paid to each of the members of the board of directors of (a) the Canadian National Railways; (b) Trans-Canada Air Lines, in 1954?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, WEYBURN —EMOLUMENTS

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain):

For a copy of all expense accounts and/or any forms of emoluments of J. W. Thompson, district court judge of the Weyburn judicial district, in connection with his duties at Estevan from July 1, 1954 to March 1, 1955.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain):
Dropped.

Mr. Speaker: Dropped.

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS—FLOODING

Mr. Dinsdale:

For a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, and other documents exchanged between the federal government or any department thereof and the government of Manitoba and/or other interested parties in Manitoba, relating to the problem of flooding on the Assiniboine and Red rivers, for the period 1949 to the present.

Mr. Dinsdale: The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources has been in touch with me on this matter. In view of the large quantity of correspondence involved, I have consented to amend the motion to cover correspondence between the federal and provincial governments in the Winnipeg post-flood period.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand the motion is carried as amended?

Mr. Lesage: Yes, with the usual reservation.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is carried, as amended, with the usual reservation.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDO-CHINA—MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT CANADIAN PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or, in his absence, to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the minister's statement yesterday regarding the unpleasant situation in Indo-China, and in view of the apparently confused military situation in other parts of that country, are adequate steps being taken to protect Canadian personnel everywhere in Indo-China from personal indignities and outright violence?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my hon. friend, who did not give notice of his question,—at least it did not reach me—would not expect an immediate reply, certainly not one in terms of precision. I am sure he will appreciate that everything is being done in the matter that can be done. If my hon. friend will permit me to consider his question as notice, I shall bring it to the attention of my colleague at once. He is now engaged on important business outside the house.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLAN

SUGGESTED SETTING UP OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY OTTAWA PLANNING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Is it still the intention of the government to set up a committee to look into the affairs of the federal district commission? I ask this question with particular reference to the fact that it seems the planning of Ottawa, particularly the green belt, has been endangered. What steps is the government taking to protect the plan?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I should like to take the hon. gentleman's question as notice because, to my knowledge, no recent consideration has been given to the matter, but I shall have it brought up at once.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR FINAL PAYMENT ON 1953-54 POOL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I should like to address a question to the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, arising out of representations from various farm organizations in western Canada. In view of the unusually serious climatic conditions that are affecting seeding operations, and the contraction of credit that the farmers are suffering from at this time, will the minister give reconsideration to the question so that the wheat board may proceed at once to start distribution of the final payments on the 1953-54 pool rather than, as reported in the press, awaiting the return of the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Hon. Robert H. Winters (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my hon. friend for indicating to me a few moments ago that he would ask this question as it gives me an opportunity to clear up the impression that the wheat board is awaiting for the return of the

Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) to make the final payment in respect to the 1953-54 wheat crop. That is not the case. Actually the closing date was April 29 and computations are being made upon which the final payment can be determined. This is being done expeditiously and cheques will go out at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the minister in a position to make an estimate as to the amount?

Mr. Winters: No.

WATER POLLUTION

BEDFORD BASIN—INQUIRY AS TO CONTAMINATION FROM GARBAGE DISPOSAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. R. Balcom (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport or to his parliamentary assistant. Is the minister aware of the fact that garbage, which might affect the health of residents along Bedford Basin, is being dumped along the shores of Halifax? Are steps being taken to prevent further contamination of the waters of the basin and harbour?

Mr. L. Langlois (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Halifax for having given me notice of his intention to ask this question. In reply I may say that at the urgent request of the city of Halifax permission was granted by the national harbours board for the dumping of incinerated materials on certain areas along the shore of Bedford Basin, and the city has obtained approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act for this purpose. However, I wish to assure my hon. friend that complaints to the effect that a nuisance is being created thereby have been brought to the attention of the proper authorities.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF ITEMS IN ESTIMATES TO COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue if he is prepared to give an answer to the question I asked on April 21, as reported on page 3023 of *Hansard*, as to whether the government is prepared to have referred to the special committee on radio broadcasting and television those items in the estimates which pertain to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, such as Nos. 56 and 57.

Hon. J. J. McCann (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the items to which the hon. gentleman has referred are usually, and this year will be, before the committee on external affairs as they have to do with the international service. I am informed by the minister of external affairs that these items will be considered in that committee. There would be nothing to be gained by having them considered by two committees. The items will eventually come back to the house for consideration. The answer at this time is that they will not be referred to the committee on radio broadcasting.

[Later:]

Mr. Fleming: May I ask the Minister of National Revenue if he is aware that items Nos. 56 and 57 in the estimates have not been referred to the standing committee on external affairs, as he will see by the motion passed in this house on April 21.

ATOMIC ENERGY

SUGGESTED STUDY BY COMMITTEE OF RADIOACTIVE FALL-OUT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. If Operation "Cue" does come off on the Nevada desert, will the government give consideration to having any information about radioactive fall-out which may be obtained by Canada's representatives at this test made available to a committee of this house for study?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Consideration will be given to the possibility of doing that, but one would have to take into account whatever arrangements about publicity may have been made with the United States authorities when it was arranged for Canadian military and scientific personnel to be present. It will be our desire to make public anything that we can make public.

THE BUDGET

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 3, consideration of the motion of Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Macdonnell.

Hon. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this debate has covered a wide field and has been extended for some days, but there is one particular subject

[Mr. Fleming.]

that I feel I should discuss at this stage of the debate because it has a direct bearing on the whole responsibility of this parliament and the opportunities that Canadians under our federal system are going to have in the years ahead to deal with the problems that they may have to face.

I do not think I would be going too far when I say that history was made in this house last Friday. I might say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Harris) that I am not suggesting that history was rewritten, but to some extent history was made in this house. I am sure that the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) in regard to the position of the proposals made in 1945, which have been so long under discussion, must have been easily the most confusing statement ever made by any prime minister of Canada since confederation.

Because it is not possible for those outside the house who read *Hansard* to refer back to other pages, let me recall some of the things that were said in the exchange last Friday. After having asked certain questions in regard to what had taken place in the conference which had just adjourned, I put these words to the Prime Minister as reported on page 3287 of *Hansard*:

In view of the fact that the government has withdrawn its position from that which it stated it was prepared to take in 1945 in regard to the unemployed, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there are any other specific proposals in the 1945 proposals not yet dealt with from which the government has withdrawn its support. I ask this question because I think it would be helpful in avoiding any unnecessary discussion if there are any other similar cases where the government has withdrawn from the position it took at that time.

Then the Prime Minister is reported as replying as follows:

I cannot accept the word "withdrawn". There were proposals made as over-all proposals in 1945. They were not accepted. I stated at the opening meeting of this preliminary conference that we did not consider that the proposals that had been made and were not accepted at that time were a proper basis for an agenda of discussions at this time.

There have been a great many things done, not because they were in the proposals but because they were considered to be the right things to do—things done since 1945. But the government does not consider that it is bound in any way by unaccepted proposals that were made in 1945.

Let there be no suggestion that anyone in this house was prepared for such a statement. I hope that no hon. member opposite will suggest that he or she was prepared for such a statement. The party of which the Prime Minister is the leader had committed itself to the very opposite position on more than

one occasion. In 1949 it went to the polls with the following declaration which had been adopted in 1948:

The Liberal party recommends that the proposals placed before the dominion-provincial conference of 1945 and 1946 remain its objective and stands ready to support the implementation of these.

That was definite enough.

Then, in case there is any suggestion that this was something that was departed from later on, may I say that in this very well produced booklet—and it is produced with all the disregard of expense which this government shows in every department—

An hon. Member: It is not a government expenditure.

Mr. Drew: From the point of view of the exterior appearance—

An hon. Member: But it is not a government expenditure.

Mr. Drew: And also from the point of view of the printing and technical presentation.

An hon. Member: Who pays for it?

An hon. Member: Not the government.

Mr. Drew: I imagine that the minister knows very well where those lavish funds came from that the Liberal party had in the last election.

Mr. Fleming: Slush funds.

Mr. Drew: Let me read from page 200. I would not want any hon. member opposite to be under any misapprehension as to the position taken by the party of which the Prime Minister is the leader, in regard to this subject, which the Prime Minister discussed in this way last Friday. At page 200, in heavy capitals so that it will be duly emphasized, we have the following:

Dominion-Provincial Relations.

The Liberal party recommends that the proposals placed before the dominion-provincial conference of 1945 and 1946 remain its objective and stands ready to support the implementation of these.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drew: I heard applause on the other side. I hope that applause will indicate that those who expressed applause by thumping their desks may not just for a moment forget they are merely applauding a prepared statement by the Liberal party, but that they actually realize that this was a positive undertaking, emphasized in special heavy type, as a basis upon which an appeal was made to the people of Canada. This statement covers a number of very definite things, as all hon. members know. There were the details of public investment which was to be undertaken so that plans would always be

available to deal with possible unemployment. Then also there was the proposal in regard to the social security program, and there was also the proposal to establish a general system that would take care of all the unemployed. These were things which were set out in detail in what has come to be known as the green book. Is this book now a thing of the past? The campaign material says it is not. The Prime Minister in his statement which I have just quoted said that since these proposals were not accepted "we are no longer bound by them". I call his attention to the fact that the party to which he belongs expressed its own conviction that it was bound to them by its declarations in both 1949 and 1953.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend permit a question? Is the hon. gentleman aware that well over two-thirds of the proposals in the field of social welfare proposed in 1945 have since been implemented by this government?

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of National Health and Welfare forgot for a moment that he had not been asked a question, for he always makes a long speech in answer even to a few words. I have not only not forgotten; I know it is not the case; and the minister knows it is not the case. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister the other day, in a rather casual way, said that it might be suggested—

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I am making a speech and propose to make it without interruptions.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not show his acquiescence by resuming his seat, he is not to be interrupted.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. gentleman knows I am not rising to ask him a question.

An hon. Member: Why are you rising? To make a speech?

Mr. Martin: I am rising on a matter of privilege. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman had forgotten that the federal government has implemented most of the social welfare proposals.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Martin: Two-thirds of them. Then the Leader of the Opposition—

An hon. Member: Sit down.

An hon. Member: That is a speech.

Mr. Speaker: It is not possible to detect whether the hon. gentleman is now really stating a question of privilege. The preamble perhaps leading to it is long and, as long as there are interruptions, I cannot hear whether the minister is really stating a question of privilege. I should like to tell him now that if the minister wishes to state a question of privilege it is his right to do so.

An hon. Member: Let him state it.

Mr. Speaker: However, if his question of privilege is one which is not really a question of privilege, he is breaking the rule to the effect that a member while he has the floor must not be interrupted.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I said when I rose that I was rising on a question of privilege.

An hon. Member: What is it?

Mr. Martin: My question of privilege is this. My hon. friend states that I knew perfectly well that the statement I had made was not true. Surely as a matter of privilege I have the right to say to this house that the statement I have made is true. Now, in substantiation of what I have said—

An hon. Member: Do not make a speech now.

Mr. Speaker: By stating that which is within his knowledge is true the minister is quite right in stating that view on a point of privilege. I am sure that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will not wish to say that what the minister has said is something that he knows not to be true.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I said that it was not so, and I repeat that it is not so. I also cannot help thinking of what a wonderful thing it would be if, under any conceivable circumstances, the minister were called upon to prepare a paper for consideration by a committee of this house. If he made a statement of gross mathematical inaccuracy and somebody corrected him, he would immediately rise on a question of privilege and say, "I have been told I am not telling the truth." No, Mr. Speaker; I am not going to ask the minister, because I know that that would start the flood, but I am going to point out to the minister that there is involved here a great question of health measures that were under consideration at this recent meeting and there are many details that are not touched upon. His mathematics are very far out when he gives the figure that he has now given.

But I do want to deal with one aspect. The Prime Minister touched lightly upon the fact that there might be suggestions that

[Mr. Martin.]

savings could be made, but said that the government is doing everything it could along that line. Whatever good things may be done by the Department of National Health and Welfare, may I say that one place where considerable savings could be effected would be in the publicity branch of that department.

There are a great many of the people in Canada today who actually think that the hospitalization program in this country is a result of the beneficence of the very pleasant and smiling Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin). Mr. Speaker, I only wish it were possible for *Hansard* to be in the form of a record instead of in cold type, because *Hansard* will not record the fact that practically every Liberal member opposite loudly applauded that statement. The reason is clear. They think it is true. It merely shows the extent to which they have swallowed the Liberal mythology. They have actually been fooled by their own nonsense. They are applauding, I know—and I say this in more than formal compliance with the rules of the house—believing that they actually have done these things.

But let us see just what happens in the case of hospitalization. Let us suppose that it takes \$15,000 for a bed. The dominion government pays \$1,000 for that bed, or one-fifteenth. But from the high-pressure publicity turned out, you would think it was the Minister of National Health and Welfare who was responsible for every bed that a patient can get into in Canada. I even see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) applauding that statement, a fact which shows that the architect of some of this propaganda believes his own statement.

Mr. Garson: The Conservatives are all applauding too.

Mr. Rowe: Just laughing at you.

Mr. Drew: I welcome the applause, Mr. Speaker. After all, there is something extremely gratifying about seeing success of any kind; and never was there a greater success than propaganda of the kind that has fooled those who composed the statement themselves.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Self-hypnotism.

Mr. Drew: Yes; it is a form of self-hypnotism carried to an extremely high degree. In all these statements that are issued to the public by the highly-paid propaganda agents of the Department of National Health and Welfare, where do we see set out the portion that is borne by the provinces, by the municipalities and, above all, by the voluntary efforts of the individuals right in the communities themselves? Oh, no. Santa Claus

is pictured in all his glory, and in the propaganda that goes out there is no suggestion that the face is even a false face that Santa Claus wears. But this is more than just simply an aside. I hope I shall not be accused of attacking Santa Claus in making these remarks, in view of some of the difficulties that have been encountered by the Department of National Health and Welfare in that respect on other occasions. But may I say that this matter is of more than passing interest because right down the line there has been an attempt to confuse the record with regard to what has taken place with regard to the whole problem of dominion-provincial relations and the constitution under which this government must conduct its affairs if they are to be conducted at all.

Before I proceed to deal with this matter at all, may I say that there was, of course, the reverse side of the coin in the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent). That is why I say this was a most confusing statement. As recorded on the next page of *Hansard*, page 3288, I asked this question:

Mr. Drew: I should like to ask a supplementary question on the same subject matter as that to which we have been referring, and which follows as a result of the question that followed mine. In view of the fact that we have been from time to time referring to these proposals from both sides of the house, I should like to ask the Prime Minister to whom we can look for a correct interpretation of what is described as the green book if we cannot look to him for that interpretation.

Mr. St. Laurent: I think the best place to look is in the green book itself—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. St. Laurent:—in which can be found exactly how those proposals were put forth.

Mr. Drew: Then do I take it that the Prime Minister has withdrawn his earlier statement, and that the green book still stands as the proposals that he could accept?

Mr. St. Laurent: If there were manifested to us a disposition of all the provincial governments to accept—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drew: That is the other side. I hear "hear, hear" from those who applaud every statement that emanates from the Liberal side of the house. But nevertheless, which of these statements are we to accept?

Mr. Rowe: They are exactly opposite.

Mr. Drew: Which of them stands as the position of this government today?

An hon. Member: Take your choice, George.

Mr. Drew: I was very much interested in that interpolation, "Take your choice, George", introduced by one of the Liberal members: That is exactly where we are left. Whether it is Tom, Dick, Harry or George, we are all left in the same position. Every hon. member on the other side of the house—

Mr. Brown (Essex West): Do not forget us.

Mr. Drew: Oh, no. I would not forget those to my immediate right.

An hon. Member: The rump.

Mr. Drew: Oh, I think we shall describe them as the Liberals to the right. They are to be distinguished from the Liberals to the left. I would not forget them because the remark, "Take your choice, George", did, in fact, come from one of the Liberals to the right. That is exactly the attitude of this government to parliament: Put any statement before the house; never mind whether it is consistent or inconsistent; never mind whether supporting facts have been made available. Then if you try to find out what the facts are, laughingly you are told, with great applause for the wisdom of the statement, "Take your choice".

That is exactly where we have been left in this session and for several preceding sessions. But this is something which calls for a little bit more orderly approach. I should think that there is no subject about which we have more right to know what the facts are than the constitution itself under which we sit here in this House of Commons. We surely cannot have it suggested for a moment that this is a matter of concern only to the Canadian government and the governments of the provinces. This is a matter of concern to every member of parliament. In the face of these statements, every member of parliament is entitled to have an answer to the question: Where do we stand on this subject at this time? When the dominion-provincial conference meets in October, this meeting is not a choice, exclusive club open only to members of this government and the governments of the ten provinces. The government of Canada will simply be there as the executive of this parliament. The members of this parliament have a right to know what the position is, and we have a duty to say what we think about a situation of this kind where the clearest remark that has yet been made from the other side is, "Take your choice, George".

That is not good enough. By all manner of means, as between any different set of facts that may be legitimately open to question, each one of us may be called upon from time to time to take our choice. But we surely have a right to know exactly what the position is in regard to these proposals to which the Liberal party has committed itself so irrevocably. Surely they are not going to say now that this is something that can be abandoned so lightly because it is not only the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) who has dealt with this matter. After the 1945-46 conference had been disposed

of, and if the statement of the Prime Minister the other day was intended to be taken as the present position, that is the time to which we must look, we find that Mr. Abbott had this to say in his budget speech in 1947, as found at page 2548 of *Hansard*:

The government of Canada looks forward to the day when the agreement of all or substantially all the provinces will make possible the achievement of the great national purposes which impelled the dominion to make its comprehensive proposals of August, 1945.

Do I hear applause in support of that statement? No. I hope that perhaps some of the hon. members opposite who did not applaud that statement by Mr. Abbott on that occasion are beginning to ask themselves: Well, where do we stand on this matter?

An hon. Member: Where do you?

Mr. Drew: After all, they were elected on that pledge, and it certainly is not too much to say that the government would be sitting on the treasury benches under false pretences if it did not intend to fulfil the undertaking given in 1953 when every member here, with the exception of those elected in by-elections, came into the present parliament. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do think this is something that we certainly have the right—

Mr. Ferguson: Don't mention those election promises now.

An hon. Member: Forty-two points.

Mr. Drew: One of the hon. gentlemen opposite has shouted "42 points".

An hon. Member: Twenty-two.

Mr. Drew: May I suggest to him a re-reading of the Liberal handbook of 1953. He will find that 22 was just a fraction of the points put forward in this beautifully bound book put out at that time.

Mr. Hodgson: It was probably 21 skiddoo.

Mr. Drew: This is not an academic or theoretical subject we are discussing. We are discussing the very basis upon which the governments must meet if they are going to tackle the problem of dealing with the unemployed.

Mr. Garson: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? If he were premier of Ontario today would he today accept the green book proposals in their entirety?

Mr. Drew: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I welcome that question because the minister is one of those who know perfectly well that I urged acceptance of the proposals when the facts were obtained and he sat there and heard me urge that.

[Mr. Drew.]

Mr. Garson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Drew: I am continuing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Garson: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Drew: I am continuing.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the minister is now raising a question of privilege.

Mr. Garson: My hon. friend has said that I sat there and listened to him accept the proposals. I sat there and listened to him, as premier of Ontario, reject them.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Sabotage.

Mr. Brown (Essex West): He scuttled that conference.

Mr. Drew: It is difficult within parliamentary rules to give an appropriate answer to the statement that has been made, but may I simply say that it is a most remarkable example of superlative inexactitude. I am compelled now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this Liberal mythology. There was no rejection of the proposals, and the minister knows it.

An hon. Member: Who walked out?

Mr. Drew: I hear one of the Liberals to my right shouting "who walked out". This is the most illuminating thing I have seen, the exposure by the Liberals themselves of the extent to which they have swallowed their own guff.

Mr. Rowe: Half of them do not know and the other half will not believe themselves.

Mr. Drew: They are confusing another occasion. The walk-out was in 1941 when the Liberal premier of Ontario walked out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rowe: You have started something.

An hon. Member: Rewriting history.

Mr. Drew: Someone mentions rewriting history. I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Harris) does not like that, and for that reason I believe he will welcome the corrections that are being made this afternoon. He wants the history to be straight and I want it to be straight. In answer to the statement made by the Minister of Justice, I am now compelled to take sufficient time to make the record clear.

Mr. Rowe: He laughs best who laughs last.

Mr. Pickersgill: That will take a long time.

Mr. Drew: The dominion-provincial conference of 1945-46 met on August 6, 1945. On that occasion there was a gratifying atmosphere of good will. If some hon. members have been misled by this expensive propaganda, including the Minister of Justice, let them go back and read the report of the proceedings on that occasion. They will find that the conference adjourned in August to meet again in November for the purpose of continuing the discussions. A statement was issued to the press by the then prime minister of Canada expressing great gratification with the results that had flowed from the conference up to that time. Then the conference met again on November 26, 1945, as a co-ordinating committee, and we discussed certain facts. We discussed the very obvious fact that the dominion government did not have the supporting information upon which to proceed with these proposals. In that regard I cannot help recalling something else that was said by the Prime Minister last Friday. As recorded at page 3287 of *Hansard* of last Friday the Prime Minister, referring to the communique issued following the conference of last week, said:

The communique indicates that there was a discussion of—I will not say "offer" or "proposal" of the federal government because those words were objected to by others attending on the ground that there was nothing complete that could be regarded as an "offer" or as a "proposal"—a suggestion that I put before the meeting on the first day when it was an open public meeting.

May I emphasize these words, Mr. Speaker, because they have such a reminiscent sound in relation to that earlier conference. These are the words of the Prime Minister of last Friday:

It was quite evident, and no one questioned it, that we did not have accurate information that would permit of the establishment of an exact formula.

We have been pressing in this house for more than two years for an examination of the whole problem, for consultation with the provinces, for the taking of steps to deal with unemployment, and yet only last week we are told by the Prime Minister that they do not have the facts. It was not because they did not have plenty of help to get the facts for them. Not only the dominion bureau of statistics but every department has some form of research branch of its own, some more elaborate than others, and these research branches were available to them. But I should like hon. members to recall, and with deference may I say particularly hon. members opposite, that during all these discussions when we have urged action the Prime Minister remained silent in this house in regard to unemployment. The government gave no indication to us it was going to do

anything about it. Then, on the very eve of this new dominion-provincial conference, proposals were given to the press with the usual fanfare to indicate that this beneficent government was going to do great things for unemployment. Now we find from the statement of the Prime Minister that those assurances were given without any supporting information. Mr. Speaker, that is reckless and irresponsible.

They withdrew from the proposals put forward in 1945. They put other proposals forward and they did not have the facts. It was just something to catch the eye of the people of Canada through the press and over the radio as this conference met. They did not have anything to put before that conference last week—not a thing. As the Prime Minister has told us, those who were there even objected to these being called proposals, and I should think very wisely in view of what we have now heard. But, Mr. Speaker, these proposals, and they were proposals, were put forward as a basis for discussion. I can only hope that on this occasion the government really intends to try to make this conference reach some positive conclusion. What I have just said has a direct bearing on what occurred in 1945 and in 1946.

In November 1946, it became quite clear that the government, this same government, did not have the facts. An economic committee, therefore, was set up to examine the facts. The committee was made up of government experts from every one of the governments, including the dominion government. Then, following that we all met again on January 28, 1946. Again, this was a meeting of the co-ordinating committee but it brought together the Prime Minister of Canada, the premiers of the provinces, a number of their ministers and the staff that was needed for that purpose.

Then, on a later occasion we had a plenary conference which met on April 29, 1946. I had no intention of going into this detail about this conference but when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson), who was there, says that these proposals were refused he is either very forgetful or very careless of his statements. The fact remains that we were discussing these matters right up to the adjournment on May 3, 1946, on the basis that we were going to meet again to consider all the proposals. Let me read from the last page of the *Hansard* record of this conference, page 624. I am going to start quoting from the statement of Mr. Ilesley, who was then Minister of Finance. After his opening remarks he had this to say, and I shall continue to read to the end of the *Hansard* record which is on the same page. I am quoting now from Mr. Ilesley, and I ask

hon. members and particularly hon. members opposite who have heard this sort of propaganda, which is the sort of inaccurate misrepresentation to which we have listened today, to listen to the words that were actually used and see whether or not they are susceptible of the suggestion that this meeting was still not a continuing meeting,

Mr. Ilsley said:

It is evident to me that it would be undesirable to indicate any particular date to which this conference should be adjourned. It seems to me that it is the duty of the government—

That is the government of Canada.

—to give consideration to the various proposals and suggestions which have been put forward. The premier of Ontario suggested, as I understand it, that we alter the basis of the proposed agreements; and Mr. Macdonald also made some changes that might possibly be made. Mr. Douglas on the other hand expressed a point of view in many respects opposite to that of Mr. Macdonald; he suggested a splitting of the differences, or compromise, between the Ontario position and the dominion position. He said, rather soundly, I think, that he did not expect his suggestion be accepted, at least this afternoon, but he wanted to place it on record for consideration.

We have on the record what has been said by the various premiers. It is now our duty—

These are Mr. Ilsley's words.

It is now our duty to give consideration to the situation as it has developed, and announce our decision in due course as to the procedure that should be followed to deal with that situation. I do not think we can do anything beyond that at the present time.

As the Prime Minister reminds me, I must proceed at once with the preparation of the budget. It is not possible for me to wait until an agreement is reached, and I will have to prepare the budget in the light of the fact that no agreement has been reached. In the meantime my suggestion is that we should adjourn *sine die*, and that the government take into consideration the points of view that have been expressed here today, and then arrive at a decision as to the procedure to follow and the position to take.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I take it that Mr. Ilsley is not suggesting that there will not be another conference. The premier of Quebec, who is not here, said he would come back at any time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drew: Listen to the laughter of those who swallowed this propaganda. The premier of Quebec was not there at that time, but he had indicated he would be back at any time to discuss these matters. I am continuing Mr. Ilsley's remarks.

An hon. Member: Were you there?

Mr. Drew: That merely indicates the complete ignorance of those who have been applauding the government for its mistakes. One of the hon. members opposite asked if I was there. I was not only there, but I was sitting there right to the very end. If the hon. member wants to read the text he will be able to see that on the page before I had

[Mr. Drew.]

been indicating the urgency of dealing with these problems just as soon as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I finish quoting that statement which was interrupted.

Mr. Mackenzie King: Gentlemen, it has been moved that the conference adjourn *sine die*. All those in favour of the motion will please say, "aye".

Some Premiers: Aye.
Mr. Mackenzie King: Those opposed say, "nay".
(No replies)

Mr. Mackenzie King: I declare the motion carried unanimously.

The conference adjourned immediately after the statement by the very distinguished premier of Nova Scotia that he assumed this conference was going to meet again. We all had a right to assume that conference was going to meet again, but it did not. When there is any suggestion that the proposals were rejected, I say that simply is not so. There was no chance of rejecting or accepting because the next thing that happened was that this government, with the typical course of action that they have been following right through—a course of action referred to by Premier Campbell of Manitoba last week—acted on their own. Mr. Ilsley, without any further inquiry of the provinces, or consultation, placed before the house a statement as to what the government was going to give in the way of allowances to provinces that were prepared to accept an agreement. There was no basic agreement with the provinces. It was simply a case of "Big brother has decided, and those who are not trying to make things difficult will immediately comply". That is the way this government has been dealing with these problems right along. That conference was not reconvened, and the only reason those agreements were not reached at that time was that this government refused to meet again. Do not let the Minister of Justice continue the kind of statements he has been making outside because in here we can challenge their accuracy in a more formal manner.

As far as those agreements were concerned, not only was there tacit understanding on the part of many provinces as to that, but there was a strong urge that they be carried into effect without any further delay as soon as the facts were obtained; but this government did not have the facts then, and as the Minister of Finance himself said, they were going to take into consideration the proposals that had been made, and that is the way we were dealt with. No, Mr. Speaker, this government scuttled that conference. That is what happened, and it has remained in that sunken condition ever since.

The conference which met on an earlier occasion was not a continuation of that conference; it was a conference presumably

called to discuss the constitution. It is still in the air, too. As far as any of these matters are concerned, this government apparently believes that all it has to do is to call a conference, make a series of statements in regard to which they have not the basic facts, leave the whole thing in the air and then employ their expensive propaganda machine to assert that those on the other side disagreed with what they said. That has been the whole course of these proceedings.

Since this impression has been so assiduously disseminated, Mr. Speaker, and carried forward even today, that in my capacity as premier of Ontario I was an unwilling attendant at those conferences, I am going to place on record something that has not previously been placed there. I trust that the minister is unaware of this because his conduct would be surprising if he were aware of the fact that the initiation of that conference started by a request communicated on behalf of the government of Ontario, over my signature in January, 1944. I am going to place that on the record. Of course the Minister of Justice knows this because he received a copy of the letter afterwards.

Mr. Ferguson: He may still not know it.

Mr. Drew: Well, I am going to remind him. On January 6, 1944, as premier of Ontario, I wrote the following letter:

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Prime Minister of Canada,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. King:

Since returning to my office, I have had the opportunity to read a number of speeches made by dominion cabinet ministers referring to plans that are being made for post-war employment and reconstruction. I find that in most cases they refer to fields of activity which would ordinarily be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial governments.

An hon. Member: Family allowances.

Mr. Drew: The mythology still persists.

I need not say that we are most anxious to co-operate in every practical measure which will assure effective post-war planning and the prompt rehabilitation of the members of our armed forces. I believe it is extremely important, however, that where it will be necessary to obtain the agreement of the provincial governments in regard to the joint occupation of fields of legislation ordinarily under their exclusive jurisdiction, there should be previous discussion so that any measures introduced will be on a basis agreed upon in advance.

At present, there are agreements in regard to health and education awaiting adjustment between the dominion and provincial governments. I believe that it is very difficult to deal with these or with any other similar agreements until we have reached some understanding in regard to the present and future constitutional relationship of the various governments.

I would therefore urge that a dominion-provincial conference be called at the earliest possible date to consider the broad question of post-war planning

and reconstruction. Not only is this necessary for the purpose of determining the basis upon which the dominion and the provincial governments will co-operate, but it is also necessary for the purpose of considering the subject of taxation in relation to these measures.

I believe that it is of the utmost importance that such a conference be held before any measures are introduced either in the dominion parliament or the provincial legislatures, which call for ultimate agreement between the dominion and the provincial governments. We will be prepared to send representatives to a conference of this nature at such time as will be convenient to you, but I do urge that the conference be held at the earliest possible date.

Yours sincerely,

To that, Mr. Speaker, I received the following reply on January 13, 1944, from Mr. King.

Hon. George A. Drew, M.L.A.,
Premier of Ontario,
Toronto, Ontario.

My dear Premier:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of January 6, regarding the calling of a dominion-provincial conference to consider questions of post-war employment, reconstruction and the financial relationships between the dominion and the provinces.

At the close of the dominion-provincial conference on January 15, 1941, I indicated that my colleagues and I would be ready to meet the provincial governments at any time they were generally agreed that a further conference would be in the national interest.

I am pleased to note from your letter that the province of Ontario is prepared to take part in such a conference at the earliest possible date. By direction of the government, the clerk of the privy council is today sending a copy of your communication to the premiers of the other provinces, with a request for an early expression of their views as to the holding of a dominion-provincial conference.

Yours sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

There was the beginning of the whole exchange of discussion that led up to that conference. Mr. King had no hesitation in saying that he had forwarded the letter I had sent to him as the basis of suggestion to the other premiers, and upon that basis the conclusions of the suggestions were brought together which were then followed up at a later time, and we kept pressing for a conference throughout a great many communications, copies of which I have in my hand, up until the time that the conference was finally called on August 6, 1945. That letter was the basis of the whole agenda, and it will be recalled that the name used for the conference was the conference on reconstruction, which was the name suggested in my letter to Mr. King at that time.

I do think it is about time that we should be able to discuss these things without the suggestion that these proposals were rejected or otherwise. There is the *Hansard*

record. The conference adjourned with a statement on behalf of the dominion government that they were going to be considered, and we never met again, only because the dominion government was not prepared to call a conference, although it was requested over and over again by myself as premier of Ontario and by other premiers right across Canada.

This is something that every member should be prepared to examine objectively. We have another conference under way. Members of parliament are those who must accept responsibility for their willingness, if they indicate that willingness, to let this government leave the whole thing in the position where their attitude is described by words used earlier this afternoon, "you take your choice, George." No; surely hon. members opposite, who must claim some success out of this beautifully published book, are the very ones who have the highest degree of obligation to see that these undertakings are planned, and that we do know where we stand. After all, we very frankly indicated doubt that the government had any intention of carrying it out, and we were certainly right on that occasion. We are not dealing with mere questions of agreement or disagreement, we are dealing with the human problem of hundreds of thousands of unemployed people who today are desperately anxious about the future. We are dealing with the problem of what answer is going to be given by the husband who comes home to his family and is asked, "Have you got work?" We are dealing with the problem of the housewife who wants to know where the money for the next meal is coming from. We are dealing with the deepest and most fundamental problem of all, the maintenance of the households of the people of Canada.

It is this human problem which is incorporated in this situation because we have been told by this government through the Prime Minister that the proposals they put forward should not be called proposals because they were not definite enough and in any event that they have not the facts on which to proceed. Let us have the facts. We have been in the position where we have two sets of figures in regard to the unemployed. We have a set of figures given on March 17 in regard to applicants for employment showing a total of 632,913. Those were the figures given to us by an agency of government. Then we are told that those are not the right figures, that the other figure is just over 400,000. If they are over 400,000 they are far too high. Which figure is correct?

In any event the government does not know. The government has not the facts and there

[Mr. Drew.]

are a lot of facts to find out. How is this divided as between married and unmarried people? How is it divided as between the young and the old? How is it divided as between husbands and wives where both are employed? Those are all factors in a problem of this kind. They are all factors in regard to which every single detail should have been obtained long ago by this government under the pressure which has been exerted in this house.

The Prime Minister blandly told us the other day that it was perhaps a good thing that there had not been agreement, that they may have been too optimistic in those 1945 proposals. That is poor solace to the unemployed who have been hoping that out of these meetings would come something to meet their situation. We should have known that long ago if the government thought this had been a fortuitous breakdown, with the resultant refusal to call another conference. Perhaps that was the reason they did not call another conference. I wonder. The Prime Minister now says that it was fortunate they did not reach agreement. Perhaps they made sure that they never reached agreement and that is the reason we were not called back. It is the first reasonable explanation I have heard on the part of this government in this respect.

Then the Prime Minister speaks about the heavy burden of war, or perhaps I should correct that and say heavy expenditure for defence preparations.

An hon. Member: The cold war.

Mr. Drew: I hope no hon. member opposite will object—someone just now objected to the use of the word "war", but to the young men who fought in Korea it was a very real war, whether a hot war or a cold war. The Prime Minister very properly pointed out that large expenditures are being made for defence. That is true, but let us look at the situation as it is.

In 1944, which was the base year upon which these proposals were made, the gross national product was \$11,954 million. In 1954, which is the base year upon which the present proposals were based—I should not use the word "proposals" because there were not enough facts to justify that name, according to the government—the gross national product had more than doubled to a total of \$23,985 million. If the gross national product is twice as much, why cannot they deal with these proposals on the basis they put forward? How much further do they need to go?

In 1939 the percentage of the tax dollar which the dominion government took was

48 per cent; the provincial governments got 22.3 per cent and the municipal governments 29.7 per cent. Last year the dominion government took 77 cents of every tax dollar, leaving 23 cents to both the provinces and the municipalities, less in percentage than what the municipalities were getting in 1939.

If the dominion government has to have a higher concentration of the tax dollar than they now have, all the authority of the provincial and municipal governments will be gone entirely. That is what this statement is reduced to; that is what it means. I hear an hon. member suggesting that that is what they want. Everything that they have done indicates that step by step they have forced the provinces into the position where they are going to find it most difficult to carry on.

I was interested in the interjection by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson). I should like to hear the Minister of Justice tell us whether he approves of the present proposals put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Harris), because the Minister of Justice has been going all over the country saying that the agreements and the agreements alone must be preserved, and nothing else. Anything else would be almost disloyalty.

Yet the Prime Minister and also the Minister of Finance have announced that they are going to have a dual system. They are going to have a system of agreements and a system of tax exemption; if some province becomes sufficiently noisy about its position, or should I say sufficiently vigorous in its demands, may we not have another system? Certainly the principle, enunciated by the Minister of Justice, of agreements only and nothing else has gone. As he knows, that has gone in the proposals put forward by the Minister of Finance. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice intends to support them because they are put forward by the Minister of Finance.

If with the concentration of funds now available this government cannot carry out its undertaking, then they never could have carried them out. Therefore we are in the position that the only way in which anything can be done would be by a still greater grasping of provincial and municipal funds and for all practical purposes the extinction of provincial and municipal rights.

I might point out another rather significant fact, referring again to the book I had in my hand earlier this afternoon.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Drew: I cannot help pausing for a moment to hear the remarks from the other side as hon. members express their approval

of this book and its contents and yet repudiate it. I urge them to reread the book, particularly the statement in regard to the implementation of the 1945 proposals. When the Prime Minister tells us that it is rather difficult because of the expenditures on national defence, I need not remind hon. members that in 1953 when the election was under way the expenditures on national defence were far higher. If there was any honesty of purpose behind that declaration in 1953, then they are better able to fulfill that obligation today than they were in 1953.

Mr. Ferguson: Do not remind the Prime Minister of those election promises. It is not fair. Oh, that is mean.

Mr. Drew: I should like to point out one further significant and important fact. The proposals put forward by the government of Canada at the conference last week were proposals to deal with unemployment at an unnamed time and on the basis of unknown facts. But what the people of this country want to know is not only what this government is prepared to do now in regard to those who are actually unemployed, whichever figures of their own they use; we want to know what this government is prepared to do now to stimulate this country so that there can be employment. What we should be talking about is the creation of employment. No country in this world has it within its power to create employment and expand production as we have here in Canada, with sufficient vigour and energy on the part of the government and its people.

We have heard already during the course of this debate that the government has confidence in the country, leaving the implication that others have not. Mr. Speaker, we have confidence in this country, and we have confidence that we have to encourage the development of the limitless resources we possess, and for the production and fabrication of which we have such enormous resources of industrial energy in the form of hydro-electric power, coal, oil, gas, uranium—all these things. We say that, with the development of these, there is full employment for all here and full employment for millions more in the years immediately ahead.

An hon. Member: All we need is a new government.

Mr. Drew: All this calls for action. The Minister of Finance gave a rather school-masterly bit of advice to the manufacturers. He told them that they had better pull up their socks and meet the situation. This

demands more than action by the manufacturers. It demands action by everyone. It demands action by this government, by the provincial government, by municipalities, by employers and employees, and by all Canadians. The outstanding fact with which we are confronted today is that Canada is no longer selling abroad in a sellers' market. We are up against the keenest competition this country has ever known.

The miracle of recovery in Europe is something of significance to everyone of us. Out of the ravages of war 300 million people have rebuilt their economy in a way that has not been equalled in the whole history of mankind. It is only a few years ago that in a patronizing manner we talked about Britain and said that Britain was through, that the British were tired and really did not have the energy. Yet today Britain, with nearly four times the population, has only a fraction of our unemployed. Britain today is more prosperous than it has ever been in its history. France, with all its difficulties, is immensely prosperous. Italy has made a recovery that is beyond the imagination. West Germany has made the most incredible recovery of all. Out of the very ashes of the greatest destruction ever visited upon any nation has developed one of the great production areas of the world and, as we now know, they have moved even within these past few years into the third trading place in the world, although only six years ago we were insisting upon the destruction of many of their plants in the Ruhr and in the Rhineland. This is one of the most unbelievable recoveries. The same is true of Holland—gallant Holland, which Canadians know and admire—Denmark, Norway, the Baltic States, Switzerland; yes, and in Spain and Portugal, right through the whole of Europe, there is a level of production such as has never been known. Let us not forget our debt to the United States, because in very large measure that great recovery has been due to the unparalleled generosity of our friends in the United States and the money they have given for the reconstruction of Europe.

Having said that, then let me say most emphatically that that is not the most important by any manner of means. It is the spirit of the people. It is the spirit of the people of Britain that you see emerging out of all this effort. It is the spirit of the people of the different countries of Europe, and there today among those 300 million people, so closely akin to us in the ideas of society and of the good and decent things of life, we see production, we see skill, we see a mounting prosperity which is of importance to every one of us. Let us thank God that they have

[Mr. Drew.]

been able to recover in this way from the destruction which had taken place. But let us also remember that we should be very thankful that that great area stands prosperous and firm in the defence of the same freedom for which we are struggling at this time. Moreover, it presents a great market into which we can sell, if only we vigorously recognize the demands that are before us. Therefore, let us do everything we can to stimulate this activity. But the first place for this sort of action to come from is the government itself. The government has put forward a proposal that there be a commission to inquire into the broad economic future of this country. That is a fine thing; but, if it is a good thing to appoint a royal commission for that purpose, then that knocks into a cocked hat all the nonsense we have heard about royal commissions destroying the authority and responsibility of government. Every time we have put forward a proposal that there be a royal commission to inquire into waste and extravagance in the government, which incidentally has been found every time there has been an inquiry—

Mr. Rowe: It is getting worse.

Mr. Drew:—we have been told that it is contrary to our constitutional system and it would be a denial of the rights and responsibilities of parliament. But these people now put before us a royal commission to inquire into our economic system. We want something to be done right away to deal with this problem of unemployment. We want something done now to deal with the unemployed; and we want the government itself to do something that will stimulate the sense of economy and efficiency in this country.

Therefore, as we approve of the setting up of this commission, I repeat our request that a royal commission be set up to inquire into the operation and organization of all government departments and all agencies of government. We have heard these pious assurances about efficiency and the things they are doing. I shall close these remarks by saying to the Minister of Finance, in the ancient biblical words, "Physician, heal thyself".

An hon. Member: A great speech, George.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will all agree with the observation of the amiable gentleman who just intervened and say that, from the point of view of delivery and the renewal of old time vigour, "That was quite a speech, George." I may say to the Leader of the Opposition, before I cross swords with him this afternoon, that I am very glad, as everyone in the house is, that during the past month or so, he has

shown increasingly if not his old-time form of exactitude, his old-time form of vigour.

Sir, I rise primarily today to answer the observation made by the Leader of the Opposition in the early part of his speech, when he took issue with the implication of my question that the 1945 proposals of the federal government have in the field of health and welfare been implemented to the extent of over two-thirds. The Leader of the Opposition contradicted that statement and said it was not true. I now propose among other things to deal with that particular aspect of the question and show that my statement is fully substantiated by the evidence I am now going to offer.

It will be understood and remembered that the 1945 proposals were a series of integrated proposals the implementation of which depended upon the finding of agreement with the provinces on fiscal measures. It was clear at all time the several and individual proposals could not stand by themselves. The federal government offered to bring in certain measures in consideration of particular agreements, mainly in fiscal matters, with the provincial governments. My hon. friend has said it was this government that scuttled the conference of 1945. I do not know whether he meant or hoped to indicate by that statement a suggestion that we had done the same last week or were proposing to do so next fall. But I want to say—

Mr. Drew: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say that in my remarks there was no suggestion, so far as last week's preliminary meeting was concerned, of any such thought or any such indication. The fact is that so little was done that it would not have been possible anyway.

Mr. Martin: I thank my hon. friend for saying that his reference was to the 1945 conference and not to the conference of last week. As one of those who participated in last week's conference, one of the sessions of which—and I think it was the most important one—was a secret session by agreement, I may say that there was a disposition on the part of everyone, from the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent) down to every premier and delegate, to deal in a spirit of understanding and co-operation and by means of constructive effort, with the difficult problems that face Canada. I am sure that spirit will prevail under the Prime Minister of Canada, who we all know is capable of nothing but understanding and co-operative effort.

The premier of Ontario—and he disagrees with the Leader of the Opposition—in commenting on the conference of last week said it was a most helpful one on the part of all

parties to the conference. I believe the way to bring about good government in Canada is by so conducting oneself as to make it possible for all those taking part in a dominion-provincial conference to say that what we have done has been done in a co-operative and understanding spirit.

I shall not say to the Leader of the Opposition that he did not approach the problems in 1945 as sincerely as did anyone else. The hon. gentleman is a sincere-minded gentleman. While we may differ on issues, I shall never be found accusing him of want of sincerity. However, I say to him in all earnestness, that my reading of the record of the 1945 conference suggests that, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman may have been acting, as possibly he thought he was, in the interests of his province—and for that I give him credit—his attitude was one of the main factors why that conference did not succeed.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1945 no agreement was reached on fiscal affairs. So the federal government has never at any time since that date been committed or obligated to carry out the 1945 proposals, since the conditions on which they were based have never been fulfilled. Despite this fact, the federal government has actually gone ahead on a unilateral basis with such portions of the 1945 program as it seemed possible from time to time to implement. The result is that 10 years later, in 1955, we find that most of the proposals have, in fact, been implemented to a degree far in excess of the levels suggested at the 1945 conference.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, might I ask what the minister is reading from, in order that I may know the source of the information he is giving to us?

Mr. Martin: My hon. friend is asking a perfectly correct question. When he was reading some of his notes I wondered the same thing.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I take it that the hon. member for Eglinton is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Fleming: I am rising on a question of privilege. The minister has said that the Leader of the Opposition was reading from his notes. That, if true, would have been a breach of the rules of the house. The Leader of the Opposition was not reading from his notes.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Eglinton rises on a question of privilege to state that the Leader of the Opposition has been improperly accused of reading from his

notes. Does the hon. member not think that a question of privilege in that sense is one which does not belong to him but rather to the Leader of the Opposition? May I point this out to hon. members generally. We have listened to an interesting speech by the Leader of the Opposition. We are now listening to one which promises to be equally interesting by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Knowles: He is always promising.

Mr. Speaker: Naturally some interruptions are in order, provided they are not disorderly. An hon. member must not be interrupted while he is speaking unless he gives his consent. I would not want too many questions of privilege to be raised when, in fact, they are not questions of privilege and are raised only for the purpose of interrupting the hon. member who has the floor. A moment ago I did all that I could to protect the Leader of the Opposition who had the floor. I intend to do likewise with regard to the minister who is now speaking and with regard to any other hon. member who may take part in this debate. I should like hon. members to cooperate. If they do not agree with some of the remarks being made by the member who has the floor, I would ask them not to interrupt on a question of privilege when the question, in fact, is not one of privilege.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—and I know in this case the minister will welcome the interruption—I wish to make it clear that I read nothing except quotations, and they were clearly indicated as quotations. I assure the minister that I was not implying that he is reading his speech. I confess that at the time I thought he was reading from something, and I asked the question actually wanting to know the source of the information. If the answer is that he is reading from notes, then that is the complete answer to what I had to ask.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I assure you and the house that I shall not be reading for very long from what I have in front of me, because I think I am usually able to collect my thoughts without too much trouble. However, over the week end, after the exchange between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, I did some homework. I find that homework is extremely interesting. I have tabulated a number of facts, and that tabulation is what I have been referring to and reading from. I think my hon. friend will find that, notwithstanding the heavy preoccupations which he, I and others had on Saturday, I did a fairly good job of homework.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The 1945 proposals had to do with fiscal agreements, social security and public investment. Under the heading of fiscal agreements we now have tax agreements with nine of the ten provinces. It is interesting to note, from the table I have before me, the payments which we were prepared to make in 1945 and 1948, compared with the payments to be made in 1956, and the extent to which, in the fiscal field, we have more than implemented what was proposed in 1945.

In 1945 we proposed to the provinces a formula which would have resulted, had it been in effect in 1944, in total payments to the provinces of \$206,800,000. In 1948 the payments to the provinces would have amounted to \$215,400,000 on the basis of the 1945 formula. The estimated payments in 1956 are \$320,350,000. Hence in the matter of fiscal agreements alone the government and the Minister of Finance have been able to provide to the provinces payments substantially greater than those proposed at the famous conference in 1945 to which our attention has been directed this afternoon.

Mr. Knowles: Have you those figures in constant dollars?

Mr. Martin: I have those figures in constant dollars, and if I had unlimited time I would go through the whole table. It is very interesting. But I shall take Ontario as an example. For 1944 the proposed payments to Ontario would have been \$68,600,000. In 1948 the proposed payments would have amounted to \$70,300,000, and in 1955-56 the premier of Ontario will have \$139,500,000 at his disposal for the services he wishes to perform. These figures make it clear that the federal government has in fact implemented the fiscal portion of the 1945 proposals for any province desiring to participate, and has done so at a level twice as generous as the most optimistic estimates of financial revenue accruing to the provinces as set out in the 1945 proposals.

Further, in return for these tax rental payments the federal government has not insisted on the exclusive occupancy of all the tax fields on which it insisted in 1945. While still insisting on the occupancy of the personal income and corporation tax fields, it now agrees to share other fields such as succession duties with the provinces.

Mr. Drew: It vacated the fields we suggested should be vacated.

Mr. Martin: I am sure I would welcome a question, but I would appreciate it if I could deal with this matter without interruption. In addition, the federal government has also vacated the gasoline tax and amusement tax

fields, leaving exclusive occupancy of those fields to the provinces. That was not the situation in 1945. That is the situation today, and points out in fiscal matters the extent to which the federal government has implemented the proposals which it made in 1945.

Mr. Drew: That was what we urged and what was refused.

Mr. Martin: I now come to the matters for which I am responsible ministerially. My hon. friend—and I think what he said was justifiable debate—said that I perhaps took greater credit for myself and for the government than I should in respect of certain acts of the government in the fields of health and welfare. I am not going to say that perhaps my hon. friend is not sometime justified in this criticism. But I will tell him and the house that the national health program brought in by the government in 1948, welcomed as it was by every province at that time and again approved unanimously at our meetings last week, is a program which I believe to be of such great significance that perhaps I do sometimes overestimate because of enthusiasm the part that I or the department or the government play in it.

Mr. Fleming: By way of self-advertisement.

Mr. Brooks: By way of political propaganda.

Mr. Martin: But I will say to my hon. friends that in the hospital construction grants we have, according to the premier of the province of Ontario, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard, spearheaded a program that has resulted in the provision of over 68,000 hospital beds in the last six and a half years—

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Fleming: You did not spearhead it. Ontario is away ahead of you.

Mr. Martin: —in co-operation with the provinces and, as my hon. friend has said, with the mightier contribution of the citizens generally in the various communities.

Mr. Drew: And after it had been started by the province of Ontario.

Mr. Martin: I am not going to say that Ontario was not building hospital beds. Of course they were. But I refer my hon. friend to the report made by the minister of health of Ontario a year ago last May. He can verify there whether the statement I have made about our contribution is an overstatement.

In 1945 there was no proposal by the federal government to make grants for hospital construction. In 1945 the federal government made certain proposals in the field of

health. In the field of hospital construction it proposed that it would be prepared to lend the provinces money at a low interest rate. That was the proposal in 1945. Since that time we have gone further in implementing this particular proposal, and instead of making loans we are making outright grants to the provinces and local hospitals. Therefore in that particular no one can say that I am not justified in saying we have more than implemented that part of the 1945 proposals.

But let us look at all the grants and see the extent to which we have carried out unilaterally the things we thought in 1945 should be done in this particular field. The total in dollars and cents of the health grants we offered in 1945 was \$14,200,000. That included a general public health grant and grants for mental health treatment, for tuberculosis treatment, for professional training and the like. Since that time we have not committed ourselves to an annual grant of \$14,200,000; we have committed ourselves to health grants to the provinces in the amount of \$48,300,000. There again we have justified my statement that we have more than implemented our proposal to the provinces in the field of health grants.

In 1945 there was no cancer control grant proposed to the provinces. We are now making available to the provinces \$3½ million in the field of cancer control. In the matter of radiological and laboratory services we are now making available \$6,078,000. No such proposal was offered in 1945. We are now making an annual grant to the provinces of \$1 million in the field of medical rehabilitation. That was not proposed in 1945. We are now making a grant of \$2 million in the field of child and maternal health. That was not proposed in 1945. Not only have we increased the amounts we proposed to the provinces in 1945 but we have actually, as I have just indicated, offered further grants in the amounts I have mentioned.

With regard to the proposals for grants made in 1945, the amount proposed for general public health was \$4 million. We have made and are making annually a grant of \$7 million to the provinces in the field of general public health. In 1945 the tuberculosis grant was placed at \$3 million. It is now \$4,240,000. In 1945, when my hon. friend was at the conference, the proposed mental health grant was \$4 million. The federal government now makes a grant to the provinces on a per capita basis in the amount of \$7,235,000.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand before you able to say—and no one can contradict me in the

face of these figures—that the proposals we made in the field of health, with the exception of health insurance—

Mr. Fleming: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin:—have been implemented to levels greater than those proposed to the provinces in 1945. In fact the health grants are now two or three times more generous than those proposed in 1945. I can say as the premier of Saskatchewan said last week, although he was not fully satisfied from the point of view of the future direction of the plan envisaged by him, that the health grants which were proposed in 1945 and which have been implemented and increased as I have just indicated have more than justified their existence and are providing for a measure of uniformity in health services throughout the country such as to make every Canadian proud of what we are doing at the present time.

My hon. friend will recall that in 1945 a planning grant was proposed. This planning grant would enable every province selecting its own personnel for the purpose to make a complete survey of its health services. This was one of the proposals made in 1945. Have we unilaterally implemented that proposal, Mr. Speaker? The answer is yes. On my desk in my department are 10 huge volumes representing the 10 provincial surveys that have been made under the planning grant, as a result of which today every province is in a first-rate position to assess the extent of its health assets and liabilities and needs. Again, in this particular aspect we have unilaterally implemented a proposal made to the provinces in 1945.

One of the things we have not done has been to carry out the full development of our physical fitness program. I must accept some of the responsibility for that. We have abandoned this program. The house will remember that we abandoned it as the result of a suggestion made by the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre (Mr. Thatcher), vigorously supported by the Leader of the Opposition. The whole house agreed with the decision that it should be abandoned.

Then we come to the field of social security, and perhaps here we have even stronger evidence of the fact that the government has, almost to the fullest extent, implemented the proposals made in 1945. At that time the government proposed a universal old age pension system under which the federal government was prepared to assume full responsibility for administration and for the raising of the necessary taxes to provide pensions to everyone, without a means test, at 70. This was in 1945, before Korea, and

[Mr. Martin.]

at a time when our defence budget was expected to be stabilized at approximately \$250 million. Since that time war came to Korea, and with Korea increasing obligations in various parts of the world including our contribution to NATO. The result has been that the Minister of Finance is now budgeting for almost \$2 billion for national defence alone.

In spite of that, we unilaterally implemented our proposals for old age security made in 1945, and today every citizen in this country who is an applicant and who is aged 70 is given a non-means test old age security cheque at a total cost to the Canadian taxpayer this year of \$367 million. Again this was done on the recommendation of this government and parliament. Does the Leader of the Opposition say that does not represent the implementation of a very important proposal made by the federal government in 1945?

We will not stop there. In 1945 old age assistance was proposed as well. A scheme of old age assistance was proposed to the provinces, including Ontario, the premier of which at that time was my hon. friend, to care for those between the ages of 65 and 69, on an equal basis with the provinces. Surely it is not news to the Leader of the Opposition that that proposal has been implemented, that it is now the law of the land and is on the statute books of this country. The result is that we are providing old age assistance on a 50-50 basis with the provinces. In 1945 the proposals set the amount at \$30 per month. We have gone one better, because we are paying old age assistance now in the amount of \$40 per month.

Mr. Fleming: You mean 50 per cent, do you not?

Mr. Martin: In 1945 we proposed—

Mr. Fleming: Surely the minister is not suggesting that the federal government is paying all that.

Mr. Martin: I did not suggest that.

Mr. Fleming: You said, "We are paying".

Mr. Martin: I said the federal government had recommended a policy, as a result of which the Canadian taxpayer was making contributions for the maintenance of those classes in our communities which we, as a government and as a parliament, believed desirable. That is what I said.

Mr. Fleming: You said, "We are paying".

Mr. Pickersgill: "We" is plural.

Mr. Martin: Now let us go to the question of blindness allowances. There was a proposal for blindness allowances in 1945. Not

only has that proposal been implemented, it has been increased. Not only have the allowances been increased, but important amendments have been introduced. First of all we lowered the qualifying age for blindness allowance from 40 to 21, and this very session there stands in my name a bill to reduce the age from 21 to 18 and to increase the income ceilings for the blind. In that particular, we have implemented a proposal which was part of a package deal made in 1945 and which, for the reasons I have mentioned, was not carried out.

A disability pension was suggested in 1945, and we now have on the statute books of our country, notwithstanding our failure to get full agreement from all the provinces in 1945, a scheme to provide for disability allowances in co-operation with the provinces. There again we have implemented a proposal made in 1945.

Mr. Fleming: Ontario had it before you did.

Mr. Martin: Unemployment insurance was not one of the proposals made because of the fact that it had come into being in the early days of the war. The fact is, however, Mr. Speaker, that there was much discussion about unemployment insurance and kindred matters at the 1945 conference. There are the amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act that were introduced two and a half years ago, and the amendments now being introduced by my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg). These accomplishments support the stand taken by Mr. Claxton, then Minister of National Health and Welfare, at the 1945 conference that the federal government proposed to make certain refinements in and additions to that particular kind of legislation.

I find that in addition, grants have been made for water conservation projects that were proposed in 1945. There have been agreements for assistance in forestry programs, and for a joint project to counter the infestation of spruce bud worm in New Brunswick forests. These are grants that were proposed in 1945, and which it is suggested in this debate today have been abandoned or are not being implemented.

So, Mr. Speaker, beyond any doubt I was justified when I rose in my place during the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and asked him whether it was not a fact that in the field of health and welfare over two-thirds of the proposals made by the federal government had been implemented. I say, therefore, that this government deserves at the hands of the country, as it has received at the hands of the country, commendation for its determination to bring forward and implement these very difficult proposals, in

spite of the fact that the government was not able to get simultaneously the kind of arrangements with certain provinces which would have made these things financially possible. It is to the credit of this government's responsible concept of social reform that it has been able to bring in these measures, in the way it did, in the face of our existing difficulties, in the face of the fact that we were then spending over \$250 million on family allowances and will spend close to \$360 million this year.

I stand fearlessly before the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and ask this question. Will he not admit that no other government, no other political party in our country, except the C.C.F., in the face of the obligations of the government during the last decade, has demonstrated by its program that it would be willing to inaugurate those bold undertakings? I have excluded the C.C.F.—

Mr. Drew: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that I have been asked a question. I say most definitely that this government is not the only government that would have done it, and that they have been simply following the progress of social development that has been supported by all parties. Any suggestion that we opposed any of those measures is false, and has nothing to do with the statement I made.

Mr. Martin: I would certainly be lacking in natural understanding if I did not anticipate the kind of answer the Leader of the Opposition has made. But I do not want to take the time this afternoon, when our feelings are at their best, to remind him that there are certain great social measures now on the statute books which not only his party but he himself vigorously opposed.

Mr. Drew: That statement is not true.

Mr. McIlraith: It is true.

Mr. Martin: I have excluded the C.C.F., Mr. Speaker. I have done so deliberately because I believe that the C.C.F., having no expectancy of ever sitting on this side, have decided that the wise thing for them to do is to put forward all sorts of proposals, no matter how cockeyed.

Mr. Knowles: But you like them; you have stolen some of them.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the verbatim report of the plenary discussions of the 1945 conference. I am now looking at page 569, and I am going to quote the words of the Leader of the Opposition. I quote them because of his last observation. I think they indicate clearly that the Leader of the Opposition, notwithstanding what may

be his feelings now, in 1945 was not too enthusiastic about the proposals in the field of health and welfare, particularly welfare, put forward by the federal government. Here is what my hon. friend said. I have no doubt that when he speaks on some other occasion he will be able to offer an explanation, but in the absence of that explanation I can only take his words to mean what they clearly imply. Here is what he said:

But since we are now discussing this point may I urge, with the utmost earnestness and the utmost vigour, that no commitments be made, and that no further promises be given to the public such as we have had, even in these past few months—commitments which dazzle new visions in front of the public, and create new appetites which are extremely costly to satisfy; and particularly that no new promises be made lightly by any dominion cabinet minister in regard to those fields which are in fact fields of provincial jurisdiction.

Of course that would cover old age security, old age assistance, blindness allowances, health grants, and so on.

Mr. Sinclair: Health, cancer.

Mr. Martin: May I finish the quotation? This took place in the plenary discussions of the conference of 1945, when my hon. friend was not honouring this house with attendance here because he was a member of another house. He went on to say:

I refer particularly to the field of social services which, at the instance of the Prime Minister of Canada himself, was declared by the privy council to be the field of jurisdiction of the provincial governments. It may be possible that the hundreds of millions of dollars to which the dominion government has already committed itself in these fields must stand as commitments. But certainly future conferences, as well as this one, would be greatly aided if the advisability of consultation in advance before new commitments are made, either in joint dominion-provincial activities, and particularly in the provincial field, was carefully considered.

I think right now we would proceed very much more quickly to agreement if some of these very general and still undefined proposals which are to be financed by a separate method of financing were to be kept on another basis of discussion until we had settled the basic agreement. I refer to that because of the suggestion made more than once that all these things must be considered as an integrated whole.

That was our very point; they must all be considered as an integrated whole. The Leader of the Opposition concluded in this way:

By all means let us consider every subject which has now been discussed; and as I said yesterday, in considering those other subjects not included in the matters we are now discussing, let us always be sure that the public knows that they are to be financed by an additional income tax and poll tax.

These words clearly imply that at that time my hon. friend did not like the proposals which I now say have to such a great extent already been implemented and placed upon

[Mr. Martin.]

the statutes books of this country, thanks to the initiative of this government.

Mr. Fleming: No.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege what has been read is in the record and is not open to the interpretation placed on it by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The words speak for themselves, and they clearly indicate my support of the principle of the proposals and an attempt to reach agreement, which the dominion government made impossible.

Mr. Sinclair: Black is white and white is black.

Mr. Martin: This is only one of the rare occasions, then, when the Leader of the Opposition and I have disagreed.

In conclusion I want to say simply this. In 1945, faced with the situation that attended the conclusion of the war, with no knowledge of the increasing burdens that international commitments would impose on the government of Canada, we did make, as the Prime Minister suggested last Friday, certain proposals to the provinces, some of which, in the light of changed conditions, may require another look. But in spite of that, my effort today has been to show that notwithstanding modifications which any responsible man will find it necessary to apply to some proposals, viewed in their entire context, the fact is that with the exception of the development of the physical fitness and health insurance program, and the timing feature of the public investment grants to the provinces, they have been implemented. Therefore no one, including the hon. member for Eglinton, whose speech I missed yesterday—and I am sure I missed something—and the Leader of the Opposition, will in the future be justified in saying they have not been implemented, because the record is clear.

Mr. Fleming: Oh, oh!

Mr. Martin: My hon. friend may laugh, but there is one thing he cannot laugh at and that is the facts.

Mr. Fleming: May I ask the minister a question? When is the minister coming to that portion of the 1945 proposals relating to health insurance, which was repeated in 1953, and was part of the proposals which were buried by the Prime Minister last Friday?

Mr. Martin: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Prime Minister—sometimes it is an asset and sometimes I think it is a liability—has the quality of not wanting to bury anything. He does not refrain from disclosing everything. So when the hon. member

says he was trying to bury something last Friday, the only thing I know that he was trying to bury was the Tory party. There are some people who suggest that the Prime Minister is not aware of the fact that the Tory party has been buried already.

Mr. Drew: Do I take it from what the minister has said that the speech of the Prime Minister was entirely a political speech and not intended to be taken seriously?

Mr. Martin: Was the Prime Minister's speech political? I hope it was. Have we reached the stage where it is a wrong thing in this House of Commons to make a political speech?

Mr. Fleming: Evidently not at this moment.

Mr. Martin: Then as to the question my hon. friend has asked, my hon. friend knows that question is of another order. My hon. friend knows that the answer to that question depends upon authorities outside of this house. I refer my hon. friend to what the Prime Minister of Canada said on that subject, which represented the policy of the government of Canada, on July 9, 1953. I read this into the record of this house on June 19 last, but as it is such a good statement my colleague the Minister of Finance suggests that it would bear repetition. The Prime Minister said:

The ninth subject I wish to refer to is health insurance and social security generally. The Liberal party is committed to support a policy of contributory health insurance to be administered by the provinces.

Mr. Knowles: And has been since 1919.

Mr. Martin: There is the voice from Assiniboia.

Mr. Argue: Wrong again.

Mr. Knowles: It is a good riding, but it does not happen to be mine.

Mr. Martin: I continue with what the Prime Minister said:

But, under our federal system, to get health insurance started the people and the government of the various provinces have to take the initiative in working out plans adapted to local conditions.

We are ready to assist in a sensible and practical nation-wide scheme, but that depends on satisfactory agreements with the provincial governments.

I am more convinced than ever that this is a field which should, as far as practicable, be left to provincial administration. Conditions differ vastly from one province to another, and services which are suitable for one region are quite unsuitable to another. We now have had a great deal of experience with health schemes of all kinds in this country, including full-fledged hospital insurance in two of our provinces.

But I do not think it would be fair to the taxpayers of Canada in all the provinces to make federal contributions to provincial schemes in only one or two provinces. Federal contributions

should be regarded as a supplement and an even-er-out when most of the provinces are prepared to undertake satisfactory schemes.

And it is Liberal policy to go on improving federal health grants which have done so much to place all the provinces in a better position to discharge their primary responsibility in this important field.

Health insurance is one aspect of the over-all social security program which the Liberal party set out to realize after the war. From time to time improvements will be needed in it and in our veterans' charter. And under a Liberal government they will be improved when circumstances warrant and the resources are available.

I verily believe that only under a Liberal government can we look for further and responsible measures of reform.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister to answer the question I put to him, which apparently he has overlooked. Are the 1945 proposals of the federal government in relation to health insurance among those which were—whichever way you wish to put it—withdrawn or buried or scuttled by the Prime Minister last Friday?

Mr. Martin: My hon. friend and I were classmates, and I have a high appreciation of his intelligence. I know perfectly well that his question is not intended to elicit information which he already possesses, but rather to embarrass me; and that he cannot do. In any event, our policy on health insurance is contained in the Prime Minister's statement which I have just read.

Mr. Fleming: Whatever may be the effect on the minister, will he answer the question?

Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, after the masterly refutation to which we have just listened it would be certainly an act of supererogation on my part if I should attempt to further pulverize the remnants of the argument of the Leader of the Opposition. But one point was raised by the hon. gentleman to which I must reply as a matter of personal privilege, because as he developed it, it was almost a reflection upon my veracity. I refer to the statements which he has imputed to me concerning the responsibility for the breakdown of the dominion-provincial conference of 1945, and those parts of the *Hansard* of this 1945 conference which he placed on the record in support of his argument on this point today.

I do not like doing this, because it is the first occasion upon which I have had to take issue with my hon. friend since he returned to the house. Like all other hon. members I am as delighted as I can be to see him back again, not lacking in all his former vehemence and vigour. But as was said by one hon. member of the house, the public may take their choice. The Leader of the Opposition placed some material on the record, and

I should like also to place some on the record and then leave the members of this house and the public of Canada to judge which is the more satisfactory account of the breakdown of that conference.

What I have said is this. I have said that the conference broke up because after nine months of negotiation Quebec would set whatever no rental to the tax fields, and Ontario demanded rentals which were \$50 million more than the total of all the pre-war provincial revenues from all sources.

Mr. Rowe: When did you say that?

Mr. Drew: The minister did not say that today.

Mr. Garson: I said that in this house.

Mr. Pouliot: Mortuus adhuc loquitur.

Mr. Drew: I just want to have the record quite clear. The minister made no such reference to any such statement in the remarks to which my remarks referred.

Mr. Garson: In order to understand the material which my hon. friend has placed on the record and that which I shall now place on the record in reply it is necessary to recall that the conference was convened in August, 1945. On the very day it opened it was presented with what has been referred to as the green book proposals, which were a very complete statement of the program the federal government was submitting to the provinces as one entire, integrated proposal.

It was debated on that occasion for five days, and then arrangements were made for the technical officers of the provincial and dominion governments to confer in the interval, and the plenary conference again met in January, 1946. As might be expected, several of the provinces took at least bargaining exceptions to the first case which had been presented by the federal government, and made demands for a number of further concessions.

The dominion government made two major concessions to the provinces which they took under consideration in the interval between January, 1946, and the reconvening of the plenary conference in April, 1946. It was apparent when we met again in April that at least seven of the provinces would accept these concessions which had been made by the federal government and that, so far as they were concerned, agreements would be possible. It was at that stage that the province of Ontario presented for

[Mr. Garson.]

the first time, in all these discussions extending over all this period of some eight or nine months, a new proposal or formula and I think I should put this proposal on the record.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I must rise on a question of privilege. That is not correct. Ontario had put forward very comprehensive proposals which were on record in January of 1946. The minister has referred to the January meeting as a plenary meeting. That is not so. It was a meeting of the co-ordinating committee which at that time brought together the proposals which had been made by all the provinces. These extensive proposals, which became the subject matter of considerable discussion then and to which he is now referring, are a further development of one aspect of those proposals.

Mr. Garson: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is quite right in what he has said, but I thought I had clearly indicated that as a result of the proposals which had been put forward by the provinces including, as he correctly states, Ontario, the dominion government had made further concessions. He will not say, I am sure, because it is not a fact, that this new proposal or formula that he presented for the first time in the home stretch of these negotiations in April, had been previously put forward at any time.

I welcome his interruption, because it makes clear that the province of Ontario had plenty of opportunity to consider the matter. I think in fairness to the other governments, both provincial and federal, it might be that this formula might more properly have been put forward in January, along with the other material which the Leader of the Opposition states they filed in January 1946. But they did not put it forward then; they put it forward on April 29 in the closing days of the conference. This was the proposal.

In presenting this formula the Ontario government submits that until the balancing factors are determined by way of principle the basic figure cannot be settled with any arithmetical accuracy.

There would be a determined minimum per capita payment which, for convenience, can now be described as "X". The total annual rental to be paid by the dominion government to each province will be "X" dollars multiplied by the gross national production per capita for the year before the payment, divided by the gross national production per capita for the year 1941, multiplied by the population of the province for the year preceding the rental payment, or the minimum actual payment of "X" dollars multiplied by the population

of the year preceding payment or of 1941 whichever is the greater. This may be set out in the following algebraic form with the preceding year being referred to as 194_y

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{G.N.P. per capita 194}_y \\ \text{"X"} \times & \frac{\text{G.N.P. per capita 1941}}{\text{subject to a minimum payment.}} \times \text{194}_y \text{ population} \\ \text{Or, in the alternative:} & \\ \text{"X"} \times & \text{194}_y \text{ population } \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{or} \\ \text{"X"} \times \text{1941 population} \end{array} \right\} \text{whichever shall be} \\ & \hspace{10em} \left. \hspace{10em} \right\} \text{greater.} \end{aligned}$$

One can understand that when a proposition with some degree of algebraic obscurity, such as this, was submitted to the conference in its closing days, it was necessary at that late stage to make a calculation of additional amount actually involved in dollars over and above all previous claims of the province of Ontario, to be paid by the federal government to that province. When the assistants of the Right Hon. Mr. Ilsley, then Minister of Finance, made an estimate, they figured that at a very minimum this would represent an additional expenditure of \$134 million, that it would likely rise to a much larger figure and that, as I said before, it would amount to \$50 million more than all the pre-war provincial revenues from all sources, including all dominion subsidies.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Ilsley had no difficulty in working out the formula?

Mr. Garson: No. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition at that time challenged the accuracy of the figures I have quoted and said they were nonsense. But if I remember rightly—he can correct me if I am wrong in my recollection—I do not not believe he at any time ever submitted any actual figures of his own.

Mr. Drew: The minister has asked me to correct him. The minister is well aware that in the discussion that took place at that time the dominion government did not have the facts, as it did not have them last week. We are still trying to get the facts, and that was the reason for the algebraic formula.

Mr. Garson: My hon. friend has made his interjection. I shall deal with it in about three minutes when I come to that point of my argument. I shall deal with it not in terms of one who may have a Liberal bias, as my hon. friend has a Conservative bias, but in terms of competent persons who had no bias in this matter whatsoever. At that time the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as the then premier of Ontario, made this statement concerning this new formula of his. He said:

The government of Ontario has gone the very limit in making agreement possible, and when

I say that it has gone the very limit I mean that it is prepared to make adjustments in detail, but not adjustments in principle or adjustments in regard to the net overriding amount which it receives.

I said in this house in February 1949, on other occasions, and I repeat now, that in my opinion the conference broke up after nine months of negotiation because at that stage Quebec would set no rental whatsoever and because Ontario was demanding rentals which were \$50 millions more than the entire amount of all pre-war provincial revenues from all sources.

Mr. Drew: Might I ask the minister, for my information, from what he is reading?

Mr. Garson: I am reading from my own speech of February, 1949, which my hon. friend was attempting to quote and which he quoted inaccurately.

Mr. Drew: I made no reference to that. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I made no reference to the contents of any speech at all, and the minister knows it full well.

Mr. Garson: My hon. friend was imputing arguments to me today which I have not made. I am citing this last argument which I made then and which I have made at intervening times, and which I make today and still stand by.

Now, I know not a great deal of purpose is served by post mortems of this sort in regard to a conference which is now some ten years old. What we should be concerned with, and what we in this government are certainly concerned with, is what we are going to do about reaching a new agreement with the provinces now to meet the needs of 1955. But I think, when a leader of the opposition gets up and in fairly clear language challenges my good faith and my veracity in making this interpretation, that perhaps it might serve the truth if I were to cite, not the views of any Canadian politician nor those of a Canadian, nor those of an amateur or person inexperienced in this field of dominion-provincial relations, but rather the views of two men of wide reputation. One of these men was sent here by his government in Australia, where they have the same kind of problem as we have—the problem of the relations between the federal government and the state governments—to study these proposals which were made by the federal government to the provinces of this country at this 1945 conference, in order to see if he could find in them any material which would be of service in Australia in arriving at wise decisions there in relation to the same kind of problems which they have. This man had

no conceivable prejudice whatsoever concerning these Canadian matters. What did he say of them in writing? He said this:

The premiers' conference resumed on April 29, 1946, but owing to the uncompromising attitude of the premier of Ontario, Hon. G. A. Drew, and the impossible attitude of the premier of Quebec, Hon. M. L. Duplessis, who did no more than reiterate time and again that the British North America Act, 1867, was sacrosanct, the conference broke up.

Mr. Drew: He must have obtained his information from the minister.

Mr. Fleming: That statement read by the minister is completely untrue on the face of it. It did not break up. It adjourned sine die.

Mr. Rowe: That shows that he did not know any more about it than the minister.

Mr. Garson: My hon. friends do not like these statements.

Mr. Fleming: Can the minister not find a supporting Canadian statement?

Mr. Garson: But my hon. friends cannot challenge them. They endeavour to laugh them off, but these are statements made by the best experts in these fields, who have no prejudice or bias.

Mr. Fleming: Can the minister not find any supporting Canadian statement?

Mr. Drew: May I ask this question—

Mr. Pickersgill: Are you in favour of Canadian babies?

Mr. Fleming: I think the minister has just made another babyish remark.

Mr. Drew: For my own information, may I ask the minister, first, what is the date of his own speech from which he is reading, and second, whether the person whom he is quoting got all this reliable information from the minister's department?

Mr. Sinclair: That is a weak defence.

Mr. Garson: I thought my hon. friend's memory was better than he has just demonstrated. My own department at that time was in the government of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Drew: That is what I mean.

Mr. Garson: Oh, no.

Mr. Drew: That is exactly what I mean; because the minister was making some extremely inaccurate speeches then.

Mr. Garson: Oh, no. This is an expression of opinion by an expert sent here by the Australian government.

Mr. Drew: This is the man from Australia, is it?

[Mr. Garson.]

Mr. Rowe: The man from Missouri.

Mr. Garson: My hon. friend refers to having spoken to him. He spoke to me.

Mr. Drew: Who is the man from Australia?

Mr. Garson: The man from Australia is Mr. K. J. Binns. He said, but not in writing, that the generosity of the federal government's offer was only exceeded by the stupidity of those who turned it down.

There is another authority in this field, the mere mention of whose name will at once identify him as a competent expert. I refer to Professor J. A. Maxwell of Clark University in the United States, who is an outstanding authority on dominion-provincial relations. At page 15 of his paper entitled "Recent Developments in Dominion-Provincial Fiscal Relations in Canada", he says this:

On April 26, 1946, the conference reassembled at Ottawa to consider revised proposals. After reviewing the two major concessions which the dominion government had made up to that time, it was then apparent that the key to agreement was in the hands of Ontario and Quebec. Except for minor qualifications, the seven other provinces would accept the revised proposals. The attitude of Quebec was enigmatic although the generalizations of Premier Duplessis were such as to connote the impossibility of agreement . . . Premier Drew was more specific in his demands for Ontario . . . A rough reckoning indicated that acceptance of the Ontario proposals would add at least \$134 million a year, possibly \$234 million, beyond what the federal government had set as its maximum concession.

And listen to this:

On this rock the conference foundered on May 3. So large a difference, after negotiations extending over nine months, seemed impossible to bridge.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my answer to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Drew: It is a poor one.

Mr. Fleming: Those two men were certainly taken in when they came here.

Mr. Rowe: Are there any more cabinet ministers to speak today?

Mr. Sinclair: Independent authority; that is what you want.

Mr. Fleming: What about some Canadian opinion?

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, our nation is in the midst of an extremely severe economic recession. Interesting as it may be to the members of this house, I suggest that this threshing of old straw this afternoon is making little contribution toward solving the main important problems that face our Canadian nation. I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of Justice, and the Leader of the Opposition were all in fine debating form

this afternoon. I am sure we all greatly enjoyed the exchanges which took place.

I think the Minister of National Health and Welfare made an interesting and informative contribution. I was pleased to have placed on record the amounts of the various grants for health purposes that this government is now making. But if the government takes this much pleasure in making the grants that are now being made—they are something in the neighbourhood of \$30 million or \$31 million—how much happier would the government be, as well as the members of the C.C.F., if the government implemented its full health proposals made to the dominion-provincial conference in 1945, and provided health insurance now?

I remind the Minister of National Health and Welfare that the proposals made to the dominion-provincial conference in 1945 were of the order of \$150 million annually from the federal treasury. The relatively small amounts now paid in health grants generally show how far short the federal government has fallen of fulfillment of the commitment it made in 1945 with regard to the field of health insurance. The Minister of National Health and Welfare and the government, I suggest, would be making a much more important contribution to this debate if the federal government were prepared to implement national health insurance immediately. A review of things that have happened in the past is all very interesting, but the people of Canada would like health insurance, and they would like it now.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare pointed out that at the dominion-provincial conference the federal government proposed that an old age pension of \$30 a month be paid to all persons over the age of 70 without a means test, and to persons between the ages of 65 and 69 on the basis of a means test. He went on to say that this proposal had been implemented and that the amount now, instead of being \$30, was \$40. On the basis of the purchasing power of the \$30 when the proposal was made in 1945, I suggest that the government should double that amount immediately by bringing the old age pension up to \$60 a month. While the \$40 a month figure is nominally more than the \$30 a month proposed in 1945, it is still far less in actual purchasing power.

Interesting as were the speeches delivered by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Justice, I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) himself should enter this debate and tell parliament and the people of Canada how the government

intends to deal with the problem of unemployment. What does the government intend to do about the 600,000 Canadians who are unemployed? We had a debate on unemployment that went on day after day. The Prime Minister sat it out, and he is sitting out this debate too. He sat out the dominion-provincial conference, so far as making concrete proposals to put the unemployed to work was concerned. Instead of a full employment policy the government proposes relief. I suggest relief is not what the unemployed want. It is surely a reflection on Canada that a nation with all the opportunities we have is faced at this time with a situation where 600,000 are unemployed.

I say that in the field of full employment no other government anywhere in the free world today has such a dismal record of failure as has the present government of this nation. The Minister of National Health and Welfare said that the recent conference with the provinces took place in a spirit of co-operation and constructive effort, but I am afraid that to the people of Canada the conference, in the words of the Saskatchewan provincial treasurer, was a grand flop. It was a failure. It was barren. Nothing came from the conference to deal with the tremendous problem of the unemployed. I suggest that one of the main things that should be done is for the government to undertake immediately, in addition to a public works program, a program of farm support prices, and legislation that will stop the continuing drop in farm income. I believe the agricultural industry is of great importance to our nation, and that a prosperous agriculture would go far toward solving the present unemployment situation.

This is the budget debate. Many comments have been made on the budget. It was pointed out very effectively yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) just how little was in the budget by way of tax reduction for the average Canadian, the ordinary farmer or workingman. He placed a table on the record indicating what a large sum of money was provided by way of tax reduction for the higher income groups. The hon. member pointed out that for a man earning \$3,000 there is a tax reduction of \$14 in a full year, but for the man with a taxable income of \$50,000 there is a tax reduction of \$954 in a full year. A married workingman with an income of \$2,000 paid an initial income tax rate of 15 per cent in 1954, apart from the old age security tax of 2 per cent. Even with the reductions in the budget, even apart from the social security tax, the starting point will be 13 per cent for a married man who earns \$2,000 a year or over.

I believe I can prove that an extremely wealthy person who receives a tremendous income annually from investments in Canadian corporations pays income tax at a lower rate than is paid by the ordinary married man on income earned over \$2,000. Let us assume this person is a millionaire, that he has \$1 million invested in the shares of Canadian companies. Let us assume the dividend rate is 5 per cent. Therefore his annual income from his \$1 million by way of dividends is \$50,000. Let us assume that the capital appreciation of his investment is also 5 per cent and that his income, if he wishes to turn his capital appreciation into income, is increased by another \$50,000.

I suggest that over the years since the end of the war capital appreciation on most investments in corporations has been the order of the day. The income of \$50,000 from capital appreciation is tax free; there is no tax whatever. The amount of tax on the \$50,000 dividend income is \$20,720. To this must be added a surtax of 4 per cent on investment income over \$2,400, which brings the total tax to \$22,624. But this man has a tax credit of 20 per cent of his total dividend income, or \$10,000. Consequently he pays a tax of only \$12,624 or, in other words, a rate of tax under 13 per cent.

Let us also assume further that this man's investments are in Canadian mining companies. He then is given a further tax credit. If the companies in which he has his investments receive 75 per cent or more of their profits from mining he has an additional tax credit through the exemption of 20 per cent of his income. I will not go through the arithmetic, but in that case the total tax the millionaire will pay on an income of \$50,000 by way of capital appreciation and \$50,000 by way of dividends from investments in mining companies will amount to the small sum of \$8,974, or a rate of about 9 per cent. But the man who works, sweats and does the producing in the mines far below the surface of the earth pays on his first portion of taxable income, apart from the social security tax, a rate of 13 per cent after all deductions. That proves conclusively that this is a millionaire's budget.

One hears it suggested in this house that our corporations are faced with a heavy burden of federal taxes, and that this tax burden is a crushing load. I should like to refer to a statement made by Mr. H. DeWitt Smith, national president of the American institute of metallurgical engineers, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of April 19, 1955. The statement reads in part as follows:

... Canada "offers inducements in its taxation policy on profits of mining companies and on dividends paid resident shareholders more liberal

[Mr. Argue.]

than any other great mineral producers in the world. Its new corporation income tax rate of 47 per cent on net taxable profits is reduced 33½ per cent in the case of metal mines and industrial metal deposits" . . .

He goes on to point out that new mines pay no tax at all in the first three and a half years of operation. He points out that allowances to Canadian residents on dividends and royalties paid by mineral properties may run as high as 20 per cent. He points out further that there is no capital gains tax in Canada. He concludes by saying:

It is hard to conceive how the Canadian government could be more helpful to the mining industry . . .

In other words, if you are a millionaire receiving large sums of money from investments, you pay a very small tax. But if you are a farmer, industrial worker, an ordinary Canadian, you pay a very high rate of tax on the income you have had to earn by manual labour. The C.C.F. believe that the government should get more of its revenue through a larger tax on corporations, a larger tax on unearned income, and should accordingly reduce its taxes on the ordinary people of this country.

All businesses are not faring so well as the mining industry under this budget. I refer to automobile dealers. I believe they are fully justified in asking that they be not penalized by the tax reduction on any new automobiles they may have had on hand when the budget was introduced. An answer given to me the other day, on the basis of a question placed on the order paper, suggests that dealers should not have to pay the tax in that the tax is collectible when the automobile is sold to the purchaser. I hope the government will clear this matter up, and will lift this great and unfair burden from our automobile dealers.

I have said that one of the main things the government should do as part of a program to get Canada out of the current deep recession is to adopt a far-reaching agricultural program. I believe the main and first clause in such a farmers' bill of rights must be full parity prices for the products of family farms of this nation. The C.C.F. believe that the farmers of Canada are entitled to parity prices. This is not a new program that we have adopted. We have passed resolutions at every national convention our party has held, advocating and supporting the concept of parity prices.

I want to point out to the members of this house that today the organized farmers of Canada are giving more and more support to parity prices. But I think I can prove that the C.C.F. is the only group in this house, and the only political party in Canada, that

support full parity prices for agriculture. The record of the Liberal government on parity prices is quite clear. The government has very few support prices of any kind, and they are ridiculously low. They have resulted in near bankruptcy for many farmers. The floor price of 38 cents a dozen on eggs, for example, is inoperative and too low. The floor price for hogs does not give the farmer an adequate support price. Even the price for grains—and this is not the fault of the wheat board—is too low and should be supported at higher levels.

From time to time the C.C.F. has supported parity in this house by motions asking that parity prices be implemented. The Conservative party does not believe in parity prices. Last year the C.C.F. moved a motion asking for parity prices for hogs and cattle. It was moved by the hon. member for MacKenzie (Mr. Nicholson) and is recorded on page 4797 of *Hansard* for May 17, 1954. When the vote was taken the members of the Conservative party voted against the motion. In his opening speech this session the leader of the Social Credit party had some remarks to make about parity prices. He said that his party was in favour of flexible parity prices, in other words prices that were only a percentage of parity and which did not give the farmer the full equitable treatment he deserves.

In case the hon. member may think I am misrepresenting what he said, I shall quote his exact words as reported on page 47 of *Hansard* for January 10, 1955:

There is a very good case that can be made in favour of the adoption of such a flexible system here in Canada, the percentage of parity that is used of course to depend upon the amount of incentive which ought to be provided to achieve the amount of production that is required to meet the need.

The C.C.F. party does not agree with that stand. We think agriculture is entitled to full parity prices.

Mr. Quelch: Parity with what?

Mr. Argue: I shall explain that. I would suggest the basis of parity, 1925-1929, as advanced by the Canadian federation of agriculture, as the most suitable base. In the past when C.C.F. members have advanced the concept of parity prices, such large western newspapers as the *Winnipeg Free Press* and the *Regina Leader Post* have come out with cartoons and editorials criticizing this concept of parity prices. These newspapers, which go into the main agricultural areas surrounding the two cities in which they are published, do not believe in, and in fact oppose adequate support prices. They believe in low stop loss support prices,

if indeed they believe in support prices at all. I believe those newspapers would be doing a service to the provinces in which they are located if they changed their policy and began supporting the agricultural industry on which their circulation depends.

I hope they will not continue to suggest that parity prices themselves cause huge surpluses of food. We read in the press that parity prices in the United States or some other country are causing huge surpluses of food. I suggest that the huge surpluses of food that may exist are not brought about by high support prices but because steps have not been taken to see that these food surpluses are made available to people who could consume them. In other words the difficulty should be corrected by improvement in the demand rather than by lowering prices in the belief that farm production may be reduced.

The history of agriculture shows that any time the prices of agricultural products generally are reduced, production goes up. If the government reduced what is a good support price, in my opinion, on butter, the production of butter in all probability would go up. Farmers endeavouring to protect their income would milk more cows and ship more cream. By increasing production they would hope to maintain the same monthly or yearly income.

It will be no service to any nation for its government to reduce prices of agricultural products in the hope of reducing production, if by so doing it cripples agriculture and causes widespread difficulty in the economy generally. The C.C.F. therefore at this time is stating its support for parity prices for products produced on the Canadian family farm. I repeat that is the first clause that should be placed in a bill of rights for Canadian agriculture.

The second clause, I suggest, should be one that calls for national marketing boards to provide, at the producers' request, stability in the assembly, processing and marketing of the main agricultural products.

Clause 3 would establish a board of livestock commissioners to provide scientific grading standards to protect the farmers' interests in the market.

Clause 4 would be support of international commodity agreements and the continuation of the international wheat agreement. We in the C.C.F. have always supported international commodity agreements. We hope they can be extended in the future.

Clause 5 would be support for an international food pool. Instead of each nation attempting to get rid of its surplus on a unilateral basis, we believe it is preferable

for nations with exportable surpluses to co-operate in establishing an international food pool, and from that food pool distribute the surplus food to needy nations. The Canadian government record on this issue at the United Nations is very dismal. The government has failed to support—as a matter of fact, has criticized and opposed—attempts to establish such an international food pool.

Clause 6. As a method to get rid of at least part of any surplus agricultural products which might arise, such as a surplus of butter, I suggest that Canadian food consumption should be increased by a free school lunch program and free food for institutions. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture, in a very excellent brief presented to the cabinet this year, strongly supported the idea of a free school lunch program in Canada, and pointed out that Canadian children do not drink sufficient milk. Nutrition standards for Canadian children would be improved by a free school lunch program.

Clause 7 would be the provision of surplus food to underdeveloped countries without charge or in exchange for local currency, for famine prevention and for a free school lunch program. I suggest that in such a program democracy has a powerful weapon to meet the threat of communism in many backward nations. I believe that as a democratic nation we should adopt a generous program of making food available to underdeveloped countries in order to prevent widespread famine, and also as part of a school lunch program that will of itself assist in improving educational standards.

Clause 8. Increased payment under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, and extension of the act, which provides a measure of income protection in time of crop failure, to all provinces of Canada, and the provision of a crop insurance scheme in areas where such a scheme could be suitably provided. I suggest that such an area might be a fruit-growing area, a tobacco-growing area, or some other area where concentration is largely on a single commodity or a single group of commodities.

Clause 9. Extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to all parts of Canada, making it a comprehensive program of soil and water conservation. The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) almost every year now for a number of years has moved a motion asking for a soil and water conservation program for all Canada. I suggest that by a wide extension of the area of application of the benefits of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, this very laudable objective might be achieved.

[Mr. Argue.]

Clause 10 in the suggested farmers bill of rights would be accelerated agricultural research. The benefits that could be derived from that are obvious. As one example only, I mention the benefits that will be derived this year from the use of the new rust-resistant variety of Selkirk wheat.

Clause 11. Assistance to the co-operative movement. This government at best takes a neutral attitude toward co-operatives, or in fact hinders the growth of co-operatives through taxation. We in the C.C.F. believe the government should take an active part in the promotion and the extension of co-operatives.

Clause 12. Low-cost credit should be provided for farm and home improvements. I suggest the interest rate charged under the present Farm Improvement Loans Act is too high and should be reduced.

Clause 13. Restoration of the farmer's right to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice; in other words, a fair and equitable distribution of box cars based on the farmer's choice.

Clause 14. Voluntary revocable check-off of farm union dues. We of the C.C.F. think it is a reasonable request; we think the government should grant it as a method of supporting our important farm organizations. I might point out that the labour unions have such a check-off, and what the check-off has done to benefit the labour unions I am sure it would do to benefit the farm unions.

Clause 15. Restoration of freight assistance on feed grain. We do not like the government's gradual removal of freight assistance on feed grain. We should like to see it restored immediately.

Clause 16. Continuation of the Crowsnest pass rates on grain. The Crowsnest pass rates are of extreme importance to western agriculture. The C.C.F. stands unalterably opposed to any tampering with the Crowsnest pass rates.

Clause 17. The immediate construction of the South Saskatchewan dam. The attitude of the Prime Minister toward the South Saskatchewan dam is almost incomprehensible. It took months of negotiation by the premier of Saskatchewan to get so much as a meeting with the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister's answer continues to be no. I think this answer of "no" means discrimination by this government against the prairie farmers and western agriculture.

Clause 18 of the bill of rights would be the marketing of all grain through the Canadian wheat board. We should like to see the Canadian Wheat Board Act extended so that all grain, including flax and rye, shall be marketed through the Canadian wheat board.

Clause 19. Extension of the Canada Grain Act to all parts of Canada so that Canadian feeders may obtain full advantage of western grades on feed grain. I think it is a disgrace that eastern farmers have to put up with the grades that are placed by the handling companies on the feed grains they buy, and I believe an extension of the provisions of the Canada Grain Act would be of real service to agriculture outside the prairie area.

Clause 20. Comprehensive investigation of the tremendous spread between prices paid by the consumer and those paid to the producer. If food prices in Canada at any time are high, I suggest they are not high because the farmer gets too much; they are high because the costs of distribution and of packing are sometimes 10 or 20 times as great as the actual cost of the food contained in the package.

Clause 21. Full investigation into the high prices of farm machinery. I believe the federal government should have granted the request made by the Saskatchewan government that a royal commission inquire into the farm implement industry in an endeavour to bring down the price of farm machinery.

Clause 22. Action to reduce the outrageous prices charged for fertilizer. The fertilizer monopoly has cost agriculture tremendous sums of money, and I believe the government, through assisting co-operatives, could help farmers get into the fertilizer production field so the cost of fertilizer could be reduced.

Clause 23. We believe payment should be made on approved storage whenever there are large surpluses of products that must be held on the farms.

Clause 24. Federal financial assistance for education to our municipalities so that current high taxes on farm and urban real estate may be reduced or at least be prevented from going higher.

Finally, clause 25 of this farmers' bill of rights calls for federal financial assistance for a comprehensive road and highway program including farm to market roads.

In conclusion I suggest that the following are fundamental to any farm bill of rights: farmers of Canada should be given immediate full parity prices for the production of family farms; there should be a national livestock marketing board and a board of livestock commissioners; there should be support for international commodity agreements and the continuation of the international wheat agreement; there should be support by the Canadian government of an international food

pool and increased food consumption in Canada through a free school lunch program and free food for institutions; surplus food should be provided to underdeveloped countries, without charge or in exchange for local currencies, to be used for famine prevention and for free school lunch programs.

The C.C.F. believe that such a bill of rights for agriculture is necessary, not only for the welfare of agriculture itself but as part of a Canadian program to solve present widespread unemployment.

On motion of Mr. Hamilton (York West) the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Harris: This might be a good time to announce that we shall continue with this debate tomorrow.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

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

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

And being returned:

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

An act for the relief of Olga Maikowski Hocaloski.

An act for the relief of Mary Evelyn Martinson Ross.

An act for the relief of Donald Muir Langton.

An act for the relief of Albert Ritchot.

An act for the relief of Annie Esther Vetter Meister.

An act for the relief of Carmen Lister Lees.

An act for the relief of Dawn Elsie Coles Ekers Bowen.

An act for the relief of Marion Murray Redburn.

An act for the relief of Anna Pearl Lingo DesMarais.

An act for the relief of Phyllis Geraldine Brown McLean.

An act for the relief of Eva Lilly Ware Deslauriers.

An act for the relief of Agnes Rose McKiernan Popadick.

An act for the relief of Rosalind Elaine Beinhaker Katz.

An act for the relief of Louis Kenneth Laurin.

An act for the relief of Eva Amelia Richardson Keyton.

An act for the relief of Francois-Xavier Lange.

An act for the relief of Aline Pelland Myre.

An act for the relief of Roscoe Winston Percy Soule.

An act for the relief of June Patricia Potter Cashman.
 An act for the relief of Paul-Emile Roland Boisclair.
 An act for the relief of Kathleen Swanson Butler.
 An act for the relief of Freda Lutsky Perzow.
 An act for the relief of Susia Earle Young.
 An act for the relief of Joseph Willie Walter Stonehouse.
 An act for the relief of Alexander Jakobszak.
 An act for the relief of Margaret Thomson Kelso Midlick.
 An act for the relief of Pansy Joy Cowen Kirby.
 An act for the relief of Isabel Taylor Page Kingsley.
 An act for the relief of Dorothy Winnifred Patricia Lawson Disken.
 An act for the relief of Annie Kofman Liebman.
 An act for the relief of Harry Elsworth Allton.
 An act for the relief of Desire Cherry Szabo.
 An act for the relief of William Edward Shanassy.
 An act for the relief of Fernand Seguin.
 An act for the relief of Joanna Florence Ritchie Leinonen.
 An act for the relief of Joseph Telesphore Origene Dragon.
 An act for the relief of Dorothy Katherine Beattie Gunston.
 An act for the relief of Ellis Hamilton.
 An act for the relief of Joan Shirley Davies Marchand.
 An act for the relief of Joseph Leon Gilles D'Avignon.
 An act for the relief of Mary Ritchie Fleming Benjamin.
 An act for the relief of Doris Wagner Arkin.
 An act for the relief of Lena Robitaille Barre.
 An act for the relief of Antonio Michetti.
 An act for the relief of Joseph Andre Roland Roy.
 An act for the relief of Ida Rose Amyot White.
 An act for the relief of Anne Gorin Seward.
 An act for the relief of George Daniel van der Beek.
 An act for the relief of Rhoda Beatrice Cree Denis.
 An act for the relief of Roma Gisser Baron.
 An act for the relief of Marie-Angeline Delle-donne Salotti.
 An act for the relief of Mary Black Guthrie.
 An act for the relief of Albert Menard.
 An act for the relief of Patricia Galley Berger.
 An act for the relief of Elizabeth Glencross Marcoux.
 An act for the relief of Lorraine Bella Spiegel Weisberg.
 An act for the relief of Frances Kellerman Rappoport.
 An act for the relief of Eleanor Grace Jones Graham.
 An act for the relief of Gabrielle Dallaire Boulet.
 An act for the relief of Phyllis Elizabeth Warner Collins.
 An act for the relief of Margaret Gwendoline Turner Williams.
 An act for the relief of Mary Ferguson Wynter.
 An act for the relief of Sheila Winnifred Richardson Hiscock.
 An act for the relief of Anne Roitman Aronovitch.
 An act for the relief of Kathleen Gertrude King Laffin.
 An act for the relief of Gardner Hinckley Prescott.
 An act for the relief of Ethel Cope Veary.
 An act for the relief of Gordon Stewart Norris.
 An act for the relief of Lucille Grenier Desjardins.

[Mr. Speaker.]

An act for the relief of Joseph Alexander Roland Simard.
 An act for the relief of Winnifred Blanche Brook McGurk.
 An act for the relief of Gitel Shepsel Moscovitch.
 An act for the relief of Susan Frosst Cohen.
 An act for the relief of Norma Constance Parsons Lindsey.
 An act for the relief of Erna Reiter Kastleberger.
 An act for the relief of Nickola Bochna, otherwise known as Nicholas Bockan.
 An act for the relief of Robert Fraser Callahan.
 An act for the relief of Ruth Barsuk Cohen.
 An act for the relief of Bernice Noble Comm.
 An act for the relief of Francis Ambrose Higgins.
 An act for the relief of Elizabeth Coyle Ellis Gibbons.
 An act for the relief of Blanche Mary Shurge Labelle.
 An act for the relief of Beatrice Teresa Mathewson Connell.
 An act for the relief of Joyce Hilda Street Janson.
 An act for the relief of Joyce Gertrude Haworth Rawlings.
 An act for the relief of Jean Eudes Deschenes.
 An act for the relief of Isidore Tremblay.
 An act for the relief of Doris Lydia Kimber Keller.
 An act for the relief of Letitia MacDonald Lanz.
 An act for the relief of Kurth Sauer.
 An act for the relief of Marie Blanche Dionne Krysko.
 An act for the relief of Edna Florence Helen Dawson Smith.
 An act for the relief of Eldora Mary Mills Pope.
 An act for the relief of Roberta Margaret Gilpin Chadsey.
 An act for the relief of Anne Wahl Ryshpan.
 An act for the relief of Marian Toba Wolfe Cohen.
 An act for the relief of Bernice Elizabeth Lunan Day.
 An act for the relief of Ross Harold Becker.
 An act for the relief of Marie Anna Migneault Cloutier.
 An act for the relief of Maria Camko Kowalew.
 An act for the relief of Martin Yvon Blais.
 An act for the relief of Margaret Moffatt Wilkie Johnson.
 An act for the relief of Winnifred Herbert Chapman.
 An act for the relief of Rocco Aldo Amaedo Mastrocola.
 An act for the relief of Marie Mae Seguin Le Moyne.
 An act for the relief of Amy Joyce Markham King.
 An act for the relief of Maureen Demers Kezber.
 An act for the relief of Eva Levine Shapiro.
 An act for the relief of Rejane Plamondon Levine.
 An act for the relief of Marie Irma Marquette Lalonde.
 An act for the relief of Marion Tannenbaum Rabow.
 An act for the relief of Walter Williamson.
 An act for the relief of Eileen Beatrice Sloan Douglas.
 An act for the relief of Madelyn Jane Picard Gilbert.
 An act for the relief of George James Marshall.
 An act for the relief of Luigi Martellino, otherwise known as Louis Martellino.
 An act for the relief of Bernice Balinsky Friedman.

An act for the relief of Rose Marie Lescarbeau Deschenes.
 An act for the relief of Florence Aleatha Geraldine Hamilton Gardner.
 An act for the relief of Mary Veronica Hamilton Campbell.
 An act for the relief of Aba Awner.
 An act for the relief of Grace Elizabeth Sinclair Peterkin.
 An act for the relief of Sybil Lavine Markowitz.
 An act for the relief of Gabriel Boisclair.
 An act for the relief of Betty Weiner Schwartz.
 An act for the relief of Lili Gourd Lajeunesse.
 An act to regulate the exportation of power and fluids and the importation of gas.
 An act to incorporate Victoria Insurance Company of Canada.
 An act to incorporate Caledonian-Canadian Insurance Company.

An act to incorporate St. Mary's River Bridge Company.
 An act to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act.
 An act to consolidate and amend acts relating to The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.
 An act respecting The Fredericton & Grand Lake Coal & Railway Company.
 An act respecting Sharp & Dohme (Canada) Ltd.
 An act to amend the Territorial Lands Act.
 An act to implement the convention on damage caused by foreign aircraft to third parties on the surface.

It being five minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Alphabetical List of Members with their Constituencies,
Addresses, and Political Affiliations

ALPHABETICAL LIST
OF THE
MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

NOTE: Under Political Affiliation, L.=Liberal; P.C.=Progressive Conservative; C.C.F.=Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; S.C.=Social Credit; Ind.=Independent; L.-Lab.=Liberal-Labour.

The Speaker
The Honourable L. RENE BEAUDOIN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees
WILLIAM ALFRED ROBINSON, Esq.

The Deputy Chairman of Committees
EDWARD T. APPLEWHAITE, Esq.

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Aitken, Miss Margaret.....	York-Humber.....	Toronto, Ont.....	P.C.
Anderson, R. E.....	Norfolk.....	Waterford, Ont.....	L.
Applewhaite, E. T.....	Skeena.....	Prince Rupert, B.C.....	L.
Deputy Chairman of Committees			
Argue, H. R.....	Assiniboia.....	Kayville, Sask.....	C.C.F.
Arsenault, Bona.....	Bonaventure.....	Quebec, Que.....	L.
Ashbourne, T. G. W.....	Grand Falls-White Bay- Labrador.....	Twillingate, Nfld.....	L.
Balcer, Leon.....	Three Rivers.....	Three Rivers, Que.....	P.C.
Balcom, S. R.....	Halifax.....	Halifax, N.S.....	L.
Barnett, T. S.....	Comox-Alberni.....	Alberni, B.C.....	C.C.F.
Batten, H. M.....	Humber-St. George's.....	Corner Brook, Nfld.....	L.
Beaudoin, Hon. L. Rene.....	Vaudreuil-Soulanges.....	Hudson, Que.....	L.
Speaker of the House			
Beaudry, Roland.....	St. James.....	Montreal, Que.....	L.
Bell, Thomas M.....	Saint John-Albert.....	Saint John, N.B.....	P.C.
Benidickson, W. M.....	Kenora-Rainy River.....	Kenora, Ont.....	L.-Lab.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Finance			
Bennett, C. E.....	Grey North.....	Meaford, Ont.....	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Veterans Affairs			
Bennett, Miss Sybil.....	Halton.....	Georgetown, Ont.....	P.C.
Bertrand, Lionel.....	Terrebonne.....	Ste. Therese, Que.....	L.
Blackmore, J. H.....	Lethbridge.....	Cardston, Alta.....	S.C.
Blair, W. G.....	Lanark.....	Perth, Ont.....	P.C.
Blanchette, J. A.....	Compton-Frontenac.....	Chartierville, Que.....	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of National Defence			
Boisvert, Maurice.....	Nicolet-Yamaska.....	Quebec, Que.....	L.
Boivin, Marcel.....	Shefford.....	Granby, Que.....	L.
Bonnier, J. A.....	St. Henry.....	Montreal, Que.....	L.
Boucher, Jean.....	Chateauguay-Huntingdon- Laprairie.....	Laprairie, Que.....	L.
Bourget, Maurice.....	Levis.....	Lauzon, Que.....	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Public Works			
Bourque, Romuald.....	Outremont-St. Jean.....	Outremont, Que.....	L.
Breton, Maurice.....	Joliette-L'Assomption- Montcalm.....	Joliette, Que.....	L.
Brisson, Lomer.....	Saguenay.....	Quebec, Que.....	L.
Brooks, A. J.....	Royal.....	Sussex, N.B.....	P.C.
Brown, D. F.....	Essex West.....	Windsor, Ont.....	L.
Brown, J. E.....	Brantford.....	Brantford, Ont.....	L.
Bruneau, Raymond.....	Glengarry-Prescott.....	Hawkesbury, Ont.....	L.
Bryce, William.....	Selkirk.....	Selkirk, Man.....	C.C.F.
Bryson, H. A.....	Humboldt-Melfort.....	Tisdale, Sask.....	C.C.F.
Buchanan, W. M.....	Cape Breton North and Victoria.....	North Sydney, N.S.....	L.
Byrne, J. A.....	Kootenay East.....	Kimberley, B.C.....	L.

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Cameron, A. J. P.	High Park	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Cameron, Colin	Nanaimo	Nanaimo, B.C.	C.C.F.
Campbell, A. M.	The Battlefords	Neilburg, Sask.	C.C.F.
Campney, Hon. R. O.	Vancouver Centre	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of National Defence			
Cannon, Charles	Iles-de-la-Madeleine	Quebec, Que.	L.
Cardiff, L. E.	Huron	Brussels, Ont.	P.C.
Cardin, Lucien	Richelieu-Vercheres	Ste. Anne de Sorel, Que.	L.
Caron, Alexis	Hull	Hull, Que.	L.
Carrick, Donald D.	Trinity	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Carter, C. W.	Burin-Burgeo	St. John's, Nfld.	L.
Casselman, A. C.	Grenville-Dundas	Prescott, Ont.	P.C.
Castleden, G. H.	Yorkton	Yorkton, Sask.	C.C.F.
Cauchon, Robert	Beauharnois-Salaberry	Valleyfield, Que.	L.
Cavers, H. P.	Lincoln	St. Catharines, Ont.	L.
Charlton, J. A.	Brant-Haldimand	Paris, Ont.	P.C.
Churchill, Gordon	Winnipeg South Centre	Winnipeg, Man.	P.C.
Clark, S. M.	Essex South	Harrow, Ont.	L.
Cloutier, Armand	Drummond-Arthabaska	Drummondville, Que.	L.
Coldwell, M. J.	Rosetown-Biggar	Ottawa, Ont.	C.C.F.
Cote, Hon. Alcide	St. Jean-Iberville	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Postmaster General			
Crestohl, L. D.	Napierville	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Croll, David A.	Cartier	Montreal, Que.	L.
	Spadina	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Dechene, J. M.	Athabaska	Bonnyville, Alta.	L.
Decore, John	Vegreville	Vegreville, Alta.	L.
Demers, Leopold	Laval	St. Laurent, Que.	L.
Denis, Azellus	St. Denis	Montreal, Que.	L.
Deschatelets, J. P.	Maisonneuve-Rosemont	Montreal, Que.	L.
Deslieres, J. L.	Brome-Missisquoi	Sutton, Que.	L.
Dickey, J. H.	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Defence Production			
Diefenbaker, J. G.	Prince Albert	Prince Albert, Sask.	P.C.
Dinsdale, W. G.	Brandon-Souris	Brandon, Man.	P.C.
Drew, Hon. George A.	Carleton	Ottawa, Ont.	P.C.
Leader of the Opposition			
Dufresne, J. Wilfrid	Quebec West	Quebec, Que.	P.C.
Dumas, Armand	Villeneuve	Malartic, Que.	L.
Dupuis, Hector	St. Mary	Montreal, Que.	L.
Ellis, Claude	Regina City	Regina, Sask.	C.C.F.
Enfield, F. A.	York-Scarborough	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Eudes, Raymond	Hochelaga	Montreal, Que.	L.
Eyre, Karl A.	Timmins	Timmins, Ont.	L.
Fairclough, Mrs. Ellen L.	Hamilton West	Hamilton, Ont.	P.C.
Fairey, F. T.	Victoria (B.C.)	Victoria, B.C.	L.
Ferguson, J. H.	Simcoe North	Collingwood, Ont.	P.C.
Fleming, Donald M.	Eglinton	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
Follwell, F. S.	Hastings South	Belleville, Ont.	L.
Fontaine, Joseph	St. Hyacinthe-Bagot	St. Hyacinthe, Que.	L.
Forgie, J. M.	Renfrew North	Pembroke, Ont.	L.
Fraser, A. M.	St. John's East	St. John's, Nfld.	L.
Fraser, G. K.	Peterborough	Lakefield, Ont.	P.C.
Fulton, E. D.	Kamloops	Kamloops, B.C.	P.C.
Gagnon, Paul E.	Chicoutimi	Bagotville, Que.	Ind.
Gardiner, Right Hon. J. G.	Melville	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Agriculture			
Garland, J. R.	Nipissing	North Bay, Ont.	L.
Garson, Hon. Stuart S.	Marquette	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General			
Gauthier, Andre	Lake St. John	St. Joseph d'Alma, Que.	L.
Gauthier, J. L.	Nickel Belt	Sudbury, Ont.	L.
Gauthier, Pierre	Portneuf	Deschambault, Que.	L.

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Gillis, Clarence	Cape Breton South	Glace Bay, N.S.	C.C.F.
Gingras, E. O.	Richmond-Wolfe	Marbleton, Que.	L.
Gingues, Maurice	Sherbrooke	Sherbrooke, Que.	L.
Girard, Fernand	Lapointe	Jonquiere, Que.	Ind.
Goode, T. H.	Burnaby-Richmond	Burnaby, B.C.	L.
Gour, J. O.	Russell	Casselman, Ont.	L.
Gourd, David	Chapleau	Amos, Que.	L.
Green, Howard C.	Vancouver-Quadra	Vancouver, B.C.	P.C.
Gregg, Hon. Milton F.	York-Sunbury	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Labour			
Habel, J. A.	Cochrane	Kapuskasing, Ont.	L.
Hahn, F. G. J.	New Westminster	New Westminster, B.C.	S.C.
Hamilton, J. B.	York West	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
Hamilton, W. M.	Notre Dame de Grace	Montreal, Que.	P.C.
Hanna, R. F. L.	Edmonton-Strathcona	Edmonton, Alta.	L.
Hansell, E. G.	Macleod	Vulcan, Alta.	S.C.
Hardie, M. A.	Mackenzie River	Yellowknife, N.W.T.	L.
Harkness, D. S.	Calgary North	Calgary, Alta.	P.C.
Harris, Hon. W. E.	Grey-Bruce	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Finance and Receiver General			
Harrison, J. H.	Meadow Lake	Medstead, Sask.	L.
Healy, T. P.	St. Ann	Montreal, Que.	L.
Hees, George H.	Broadview	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
Hellyer, P. T.	Davenport	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Henderson, W. J.	Kingston	Kingston, Ont.	L.
Henry, Charles	Rosedale	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Herridge, H. W.	Kootenay West	Nakusp, B.C.	C.C.F.
Hodgson, C. W.	Victoria (Ont.)	Haliburton, Ont.	P.C.
Hollingworth, A. H.	York Centre	Toronto, Ont.	L.
Holowach, Ambrose	Edmonton East	Edmonton, Alta.	S.C.
Hosking, H. A.	Wellington South	Guelph, Ont.	L.
Houck, W. L.	Niagara Falls	Niagara Falls, Ont.	L.
Howe, Right Hon. C. D.	Port Arthur	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Trade and Commerce and Minister of Defence Production			
Howe, W. M.	Wellington-Huron	Arthur, Ont.	P.C.
Huffman, E. B.	Kent (Ont.)	Blenheim, Ont.	L.
Hunter, John	Parkdale	Toronto, Ont.	L.
James, John M.	Durham	Bowmanville, Ont.	L.
Johnson, W. M.	Kindersley	Beadle, Sask.	C.C.F.
Johnston, C. E.	Bow River	Calgary, Alta.	S.C.
Jones, O. L.	Okanagan Boundary	Kelowna, B.C.	C.C.F.
Jutras, Rene N.	Provencher	Tellicler, Man.	L.
Kickham, T. J.	Kings	Souris, P.E.I.	L.
Kirk, J. R.	Antigonish-Guysborough	Antigonish, N.S.	L.
Kirk, T. A. M.	Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare	Yarmouth, N.S.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Postmaster General			
Knight, R. R.	Saskatoon	Saskatoon, Sask.	C.C.F.
Knowles, Stanley	Winnipeg North Centre	Winnipeg, Man.	C.C.F.
LaCroix, Wilfrid	Quebec-Montmorency	Quebec, Que.	L.
Lafontaine, Joseph	Megantic	Theford Mines, Que.	L.
Langlois, Joseph	Berthier-Maskinonge-Delanaudiere	St. Justin, Que.	L.
Langlois, L.	Gaspe	Ste. Anne des Monts, Que.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Transport			
Lapointe, Hon. Hugues	Lotbiniere	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Veterans Affairs			
Lavigne, Albert	Stormont	Cornwall, Ont.	L.
Leboe, B. R.	Cariboo	Prince George, B.C.	S.C.
Leduc, Edgar	Jacques Cartier-Lasalle	Lachine, Que.	L.
Leduc, Rodolphe	Gatineau	Maniwaki, Que.	L.
Leduc, Yves	Verdun	Verdun, Que.	L.
Lefrançois, J. E.	Laurier	Montreal, Que.	L.
Legare, Gerard	Rimouski	Rimouski, Que.	L.

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Lennard, F. E.	Wentworth	Dundas, Ont.	P.C.
Lesage, Hon. Jean	Montmagny-L'Islet	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources			
Low, Solon E.	Peace River	Ottawa, Ont.	S.C.
Lusby, A. R.	Cumberland	Amherst, N.S.	L.
Macdonnell, J. M.	Greenwood	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
MacDougall, J. L.	Vancouver-Burrard	Vancouver, B.C.	L.
MacEachen, A. J.	Inverness-Richmond	Inverness, N.S.	L.
MacInnis, Angus	Vancouver-Kingsway	Vancouver, B.C.	C.C.F.
MacKenzie, H. A.	Lambton-Kent	Watford, Ont.	L.
MacLean, J. A.	Queens	Beatons Mills, P.E.I.	P.C.
MacNaught, J. Watson	Prince	Summerside, P.E.I.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Fisheries			
Macnaughton, Alan	Mount Royal	Montreal, Que.	L.
McBain, James A.	Elgin	St. Thomas, Ont.	P.C.
McCann, Hon. J. J.	Renfrew South	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of National Revenue			
McCubbin, Robert	Middlesex West	Strathroy, Ont.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of Agriculture			
McCulloch, H. B.	Pictou	New Glasgow, N.S.	L.
McCullough, E. G.	Moose Mountain	Manor, Sask.	C.C.F.
McDonald, W. K.	Parry Sound-Muskoka	Sundridge, Ont.	L.
McGregor, R. H.	York East	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
McIlraith, G. J.	Ottawa West	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
McIvor, Daniel	Fort William	Fort William, Ont.	L.
McLeod, G. W.	Okanagan-Revelstoke	Enderby, B.C.	S.C.
McMillan, W. H.	Welland	Thorold, Ont.	L.
McWilliam, G. R.	Northumberland-Miramichi	Newcastle, N.B.	L.
Maltais, Auguste	Charlevoix	Sillery, Que.	L.
Mang, H. P.	Qu'Appelle	Edenwold, Sask.	L.
Marler, Hon. George C.	St. Antoine-Westmount	Montreal, Que.	L.
Minister of Transport			
Martin, Hon. Paul	Essex East	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of National Health and Welfare			
Masse, Arthur	Kamouraska	Quebec, Que.	L.
Matheson, N. A.	Queens	Southport, P.E.I.	L.
Meunier, Adrien	Papineau	Montreal, Que.	L.
Michaud, H. J.	Kent (N.B.)	Buctouche, N.B.	L.
Michener, Roland	St. Paul's	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
Mitchell, D. R.	Sudbury	Sudbury, Ont.	L.
Mitchell, R. W.	London	London, Ont.	P.C.
Monette, Marcel	Mercier	Pointe-aux-Trembles, Que.	L.
Monteith, J. W.	Perth	Stratford, Ont.	P.C.
Montgomery, G. W.	Victoria-Carleton	Woodstock, N.B.	P.C.
Murphy, H. J.	Westmorland	Moncton, N.B.	L.
Murphy, J. W.	Lambton West	Camlachie, Ont.	P.C.
Nesbitt, W. B.	Oxford	Woodstock, Ont.	P.C.
Nicholson, A. M.	Mackenzie	Sturgis, Sask.	C.C.F.
Nickle, Carl O.	Calgary South	Calgary, Alta.	P.C.
Nixon, G. E.	Algoma West	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	L.
Noseworthy, J. W.	York South	Toronto, Ont.	C.C.F.
Nowlan, G. C.	Digby-Annapolis-Kings	Wolfville, N.S.	P.C.
Pallett, John	Peel	Islington, Ont.	P.C.
Patterson, A. B.	Fraser Valley	Abbotsford, B.C.	S.C.
Pearkes, G. R.	Esquimalt-Saanich	Victoria, B.C.	P.C.
Pearson, Hon. L. B.	Algoma East	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Secretary of State for External Affairs			

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Perron, Robert	Dorchester	Sillery, Que.	P.C.
Philpott, Elmore	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.	L.
Picard, L. Philippe	Bellechasse	Quebec, Que.	L.
Pickersgill, Hon. J. W.	Bonavista-Twillingate	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Citizenship and Immigration			
Pinard, Hon. Roch	Chambly-Rouville	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Secretary of State			
Pommer, W. A.	Lisgar	Manitou, Man.	L.
Poulin, Raoul	Beauce	St. Martin de Beauce, Que.	Ind.
Pouliot, Jean-François	Temiscouata	Riviere du Loup, Que.	L.
Power, Hon. C. G.	Quebec South	Quebec, Que.	L.
Power, J. A.	St. John's West	St. John's, Nfld.	L.
Proudfoot, J. H.	Pontiac-Timiskaming	Fort Coulonge, Que.	L.
Prudham, Hon. George	Edmonton West	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys			
Purdy, G. T.	Colchester-Hants	Truro, N.S.	L.
Quelch, Victor	Acadia	Banff, Alta.	S.C.
Ratelle, J. G.	Lafontaine	Montreal, Que.	L.
Regier, Erhart	Burnaby-Coquitlam	New Westminster, B.C.	C.C.F.
Reinke, R. E.	Hamilton South	Hamilton, Ont.	L.
Richard, J. A.	St. Maurice-Lafleche	Shawinigan Falls, Que.	L.
Richard, J. T.	Ottawa East	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Richardson, C. S.	St. Lawrence-St. George	Montreal, Que.	L.
Roberge, L. E.	Stanstead	Rock Island, Que.	L.
Robertson, F. G.	Northumberland (Ont.)	Cobourg, Ont.	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of National Health and Welfare			
Robichaud, H. J.	Gloucester	Caraquet, N.B.	L.
Robinson, A. E.	Bruce	Kincardine, Ont.	P.C.
Robinson, W. A.	Simcoe East	Midland, Ont.	L.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees			
Rochefort, J. I.	Champlain	Cap de la Madeleine, Que.	L.
Ross, T. H.	Hamilton East	Hamilton, Ont.	L.
Rouleau, Guy	Dollard	Montreal, Que.	L.
Rowe, Hon. W. Earl	Dufferin-Simcoe	Newton Robinson, Ont.	P.C.
Roy, Gustave	Labelle	Mont Laurier, Que.	L.
St. Laurent, Right Hon. L. S.	Quebec East	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Prime Minister			
Schneider, N. C.	Waterloo North	Kitchener, Ont.	L.
Shaw, F. D.	Red Deer	Innisfail, Alta.	S.C.
Shipley, Mrs. Ann	Timiskaming	Kirkland Lake, Ont.	L.
Simmons, J. A.	Yukon	Whitehorse, Y. T.	L.
Sinclair, Hon. James	Coast-Capilano	Ottawa, Ont.	L.
Minister of Fisheries			
Small, R. H.	Danforth	Toronto, Ont.	P.C.
Smith, J. E.	York North	Richmond Hill, Ont.	L.
Stanton, Hayden	Leeds	Seeleys Bay, Ont.	P.C.
Starr, Michael	Ontario	Oshawa, Ont.	P.C.
Stewart, Alistair	Winnipeg North	Winnipeg, Man.	C.C.F.
Stick, L. T.	Trinity-Conception	Bay Roberts, Nfld.	L.
Stuart, A. W.	Charlotte	St. Andrews, N.B.	L.
Studer, Irvin	Swift Current-Maple Creek	Lac Pelletier, Sask.	L.
Thatcher, W. Ross	Moose Jaw-Lake Centre	Moose Jaw, Sask.	Ind.
Thibault, Leandre	Matapedia-Matane	Matane, Que.	L.
Thomas, Ray	Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin, Alta.	S.C.
Trainor, O. C.	Winnipeg South	Winnipeg, Man.	P.C.
Tucker, W. A.	Rosthern	Rosthern, Sask.	L.
Tustin, G. J.	Prince Edward-Lennox	Napanee, Ont.	P.C.

Name of Member	Constituency	Address	Political Affiliation
Valois, Philippe.....	Argenteuil-Two Mountains..	Lachute, Que.....	L.
Viau, Fernand.....	St. Boniface.....	St. Boniface, Man.....	L.
Villeneuve, Georges.....	Roberval.....	Mistassini, Que.....	L.
Vincent, Auguste.....	Longueuil.....	Montreal, Que.....	L.
Weaver, G. D.....	Churchill.....	Flin Flon, Man.....	L.
Weir, W. G.....	Portage-Neepawa.....	Carman, Man.....	L.
Parliamentary Assistant to Prime Minister			
Weselak, A. B.....	Springfield.....	Beausejour, Man.....	L.
White, A. W. A.....	Waterloo South.....	Galt, Ont.....	L.
White, G. S.....	Hastings-Frontenac.....	Madoc, Ont.....	P.C.
White, H. O.....	Middlesex East.....	Glanworth, Ont.....	P.C.
Winch, Harold E.....	Vancouver East.....	Vancouver, B.C.....	C.C.F.
Winters, Hon. Robert H.....	Queens-Lunenburg.....	Ottawa, Ont.....	L.
Minister of Public Works			
Wylie, W. D.....	Medicine Hat.....	Medicine Hat, Alta.....	S.C.
Yuill, Charles.....	Jasper-Edson.....	Barrhead, Alta.....	S.C.
Zaplitny, F. S.....	Dauphin.....	Dauphin, Man.....	C.C.F.

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)

COMPLIMENTS
Sam. Balcom, M. P.,
HALIFAX, N. S.