

Oral Questions

will be further burdened by additions to their welfare rolls? I ask the minister, who is responsible for co-ordinating government programs, what new initiatives he is able to announce to the House, or is he going to wait for the staging of the first ministers' conference in February, with the unemployment rolls growing by leaps and bounds in the meantime?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member, instead of waiting until the very last minute, in October 1976 we announced a five year program of job creation both for the young and for adult individuals in Canada. I have indicated that one phase of this particular program created 116,000 jobs. If we could move forward the finance bill from clause 4 to clause 116, the opposition would have an opportunity to play a part in creating jobs in this country.

UNEMPLOYMENT—SUGGESTED CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCES
ON NEW INITIATIVES TO SOLVE PROBLEM

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I remind the minister, as he well knows, that job creation is lagging far behind the increase in unemployment. That is a serious problem which we are facing in this country which the minister does not seem to appreciate. Given the facts that this critically high level of unemployment is concentrated in the five eastern provinces, one being the province of the minister responsible for federal-provincial relations whom I hear interjecting, can we expect from him and his colleagues any new initiatives? Will they at least sit down now with the manpower ministers of these five provinces and offer something a little more positive than he offered the four manpower ministers from the Atlantic provinces, whom he offered nothing earlier this month?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Here again, Mr. Speaker, we deal with these problems on a full day, full week basis, not in five or ten seconds during the question period. This is an on-going problem that we recognize and live with on a day-to-day basis, and why we are bringing in programs to help the very people the hon. member says we should be helping. We met with the Manpower offices, and this particular meeting was taken on the initiative of provincial ministers to indicate some of the areas that they would like to see changed.

● (1432)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cullen: The hon. member is not interested in the answer, he is only making a noise.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

KEABLE INQUIRY—MINISTER'S VIEW OF MANDATE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General and relates to statements attributed

[Mr. McGrath.]

to his counsel at the Keable inquiry yesterday. Is it the Solicitor General's decision that the mandate of that inquiry only includes acts that may be considered illegal, and that it would be operating outside its mandate if it considered "unauthorized activities that may be immoral or questionable"; is that the Solicitor General's position in respect of the operation of the Keable inquiry?

[Translation]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is not my responsibility to determine which kind of authority has been given to the Keable inquiry. I think an order of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec establishes clearly the limitations of the jurisdiction of this commission. The Lieutenant-Governor's order in council says that the mandate of the Keable Commission covers four very specific criminal acts, namely the APLQ break-in, the arson of a barn, the theft of dynamite and the obtaining of lists of members of the Parti Québécois. I think that the order in council also refers to other activities of a similar nature. Obviously our position is that the commission has full authority to investigate the specific illegal acts which are mentioned in the Quebec Lieutenant Governor's order in council but our position is also very clear that the terms of reference of this commission should certainly not include investigation of the day-to-day operations of the RCMP.

[English]

KEABLE INQUIRY—POSSIBLE FURTHER ACTION TO INHIBIT
OPERATIONS

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, last Monday in the absence of the Solicitor General I asked his colleague, the Minister of Justice, what further action, be it legal or political, was being considered with regard to inhibiting the operations of that inquiry, and he replied he could not answer because counsel was being consulted. Has that consultation been completed, and what action, be it legal or political, is being considered by the Solicitor General and his colleagues?

[Translation]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the consultation with our counsels is now over. It was a consultation with our legal advisers about the decision given in Montreal last week by Mr. Justice Hugessen. The consultations dealt with whether or not we should appeal that decision. As hon. members will recall, the decision was simply not to grant the deferment we had required from the Superior Court of Montreal until the study of the merits of our request in evocation on December 6. We have decided not to appeal against the refusal of the deferment pronounced by Mr. Justice Hugessen, but naturally we intend to pursue this affair before the Superior Court of Montreal on December 6 so that the audition on the merits will take place.