

Oral Questions

strictly within the limits of the six and five program. Further, Section 16 of the Public Service Compensation Restraint Act states that the Governor in Council can take this kind of step where employees accept a collective agreement or where a compensation plan is applied to them consistent with the six and five principle.

This is not the first time the Section has been used. It was used at least twice previously, to my recollection, when employees working within the Public Service negotiated an agreement with Treasury Board as employer whereby they accepted the six and five compensation framework and made adjustments within it. Therefore, these steps were taken before at the request of employees of the Public Service, and I am glad the Hon. Member is willing to say that they are friends of the Government.

REASON FOR EXEMPTIONS

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Madam Speaker, the Minister should ensure that his brain is in gear before engaging his jaw. How can he suggest that exempting Crown corporations from the six and five law is the way in which employees of Crown corporations comply with the law? That is an absurdity on the surface of it.

This is the same Minister who could not explain how it was that senior executives in the Public Service avoided six and five by simply upgrading. We now have twice as many managers as we had previous to six and five, which was another way of avoiding it. The Minister has not explained to the House how many Crown corporations and how many other groups have been exempted. He still has not explained why. We know it is Section 16, but why are they exempted?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I am afraid my hon. friend is also unaware of my exchange with his colleague seated a few rows behind him on the subject, and the press release I issued explaining that we have not created more managers. There was the implementation of a new category of management, starting back in 1980, and in it are only those people who were managers previously. Therefore, it was not a device used in any way to create additional managers to whom the six and five program does not apply.

The second thing I want to say is that Section 16 of the Act passed by this Parliament said that the Act formally would not apply where there are agreements or compensation plans within the six and five framework. The employees of Canada Lands Corporation are not entitled to get more than six and five. That is the fact and exactly the case in so far as I am aware of it.

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

CRUISE MISSILE TESTING—POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. An article which appeared in many newspapers today quotes the Prime Minister on the question of the Cruise missile. The Prime Minister indicated that in part the development of the Cruise can be justified as being necessitated for defence against the deployment of the Soviet SS-20. While the SS-20 ought never have to have been deployed, the relevant question being pursued by many people now is whether this action by the Soviet Union necessitates a further escalation in the West.

Considering that literally hundreds of thousands of North Americans, including many experts, have said that now is the time to break the vicious circle of nuclear armaments, why is the Prime Minister not supporting this disarmament movement but instead continues to support the testing of the Cruise?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I must first point out that there has been no request made of Canada to test the Cruise. There is, therefore, no support for the testing of the Cruise. It has not been asked of us and, therefore, we have not given an answer.

I just wish to correct the end of the question. The substance of the question is to ask why do we not support the peace movement now rather than say we should make sure that there is an answer within NATO against the SS-20. It seems to me there may be an honest disagreement there. To me it is not illogical to use the possibility of deploying the Cruise and the Pershing II to get the Soviets to withdraw all or some of their SS-20s. The argument, of course, rests on whether the SS-20s were necessary or whether they were just an escalation by the Soviets. If they are, as NATO holds, a needless escalation by the Soviets, the problem for the NATO force is how can we get the Soviets to de-escalate. There the proof of the pudding is in the results.

The two-track strategy adopted by NATO in 1979 has led Secretary Andropov twice to propose reductions of the SS-20, once in December and once just a week ago. Therefore it seems to me that we cannot condemn in advance any potential deployment by NATO of a European Euromissile if the result of it continues to be as it is now, a reduction in the number of these SS-20s.

VIEWS OF FORMER HEAD OF U.S. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister, who has followed the literature on this with some care, I understand, knows perfectly well that whenever there is an escalation it is always justified by either side in terms of being a step required to get the opponent to come to terms with regard to negotiations or to de-escalate on the other side. I see the Prime Minister nodding to that. In short, it is