

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 5, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### SOCIAL SECURITY

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a very important motion.

As during the past two years, six federal-provincial conferences were held on social welfare especially the guaranteed minimum income, as those conferences up to now have cost several thousand dollars to the Canadian taxpayers and as under the circumstances, it deals with a prime issue, I move seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That this House consider in the shortest possible time the Social Credit proposals aimed at establishing a guaranteed annual income paid universally to all Canadian people to enable them to enjoy some financial and material security.

**Mr. Speaker:** Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such a consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Since there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

\* \* \*

[English]

### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AS AMBASSADOR TO PARIS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion which is self-explanatory. I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

With reference to the appointment of ambassadors on the basis of politics and cabinet service instead of the promotion of Department of External Affairs personnel on the basis of experience, and in view of the necessity that this practice should cease, the House requests the Secretary of State for External Affairs to confirm or otherwise whether the Minister of Communications (Mr. Pelletier) has been appointed ambassador to Paris, the announcement presently scheduled to be made later this week by the Prime Minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion being proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43, the unanimous consent of the House is required. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**An hon. Member:** We shall miss you, Gérard!

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

VAILLANCOURT CASE—POSSIBILITY OF SOLICITOR GENERAL DISSOCIATING HIMSELF FROM CABINET REVIEW OF CASE

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Acting Prime Minister. The Solicitor General having said quite frankly in the House on Friday, I think it was, that he could not be associated in any way with an execution—with capital punishment—may I ask, without in any way criticizing the hon. gentleman for holding the views he does, whether, in order to protect the integrity of the exercise of the Royal prerogative on the basis of mercy and not on the ground of the repugnancy of the law, the Solicitor General has dissociated himself from any pending cabinet decision regarding the Vaillancourt or any similar case?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** The Vaillancourt case or any other such case has not yet come before cabinet, so the question is inapplicable.

SUGGESTION SOLICITOR GENERAL SHOULD NOT CONTINUE IN THAT PORTFOLIO IN VIEW OF HIS STATEMENT ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A further question to the Acting Prime Minister. The Solicitor General having presented to parliament the legislation which governs the situation at the present time, and having voted for the measure after an unsuccessful attempt to have it amended, is it the position of the government that it is proper for the Solicitor General to continue in his portfolio in view of this frank statement that he cannot go along with the law as it now stands—the law which it is his responsibility to administer?