

the Prime Minister in a position to tell us that having agreed that the correspondence should be before the commission, the government is willing that it be before the commission at a public hearing?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the government has been that everything it had on the whole subject of the RCMP would be put before the McDonald commission. But many of the subjects inquired into by the commission are either of a security nature or they have to do with secrecy of cabinet, and so forth; that is why the McDonald commission has been given authority to hold certain meetings in camera.

Not having been party to the correspondence and not having looked at it, I cannot state at this time what the arguments will be relating to that particular part of the testimony. It is important to know that it is all before the McDonald commission and that the commission will bring it forth in evidence in the normal course of events. I do not know if the commission will want to do this in camera or in public.

* * *

TRADE

IMPACT OF U.S. ACTION ON BEEF QUOTAS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to one asked earlier by the hon. member for Fort William, who carefully and quite rightly avoided any criticism of farm incomes in his question about beef prices.

My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I wonder if the minister has yet been able to do a specific analysis of the impact of the recent U.S. action on beef quotas and what impact that action might have upon the Canadian scene. Also, can the minister give us the assurance that no Canadian action will be taken which would impact negatively on the recovering incomes of Canadian beef producers?

Hon. Jack H. Horner (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as of June 2 the quota allotments for beef coming into Canada from Australia and New Zealand were 28 per cent behind those of a year ago. About 17 million fewer pounds came into Canada from Australia and New Zealand as of June 2 this year, compared with up to June 2, 1977. Allowing Australia and New Zealand to bring in more meat would not in any way affect today's prices because there is plenty of room in their allotment now for them to bring over more beef.

With regard to beef moving to the United States from Canada, our movement of dressed beef is 21 per cent behind what it was a year ago. As of June 2, about 11 million fewer pounds than last year moved from Canada to the United States. So I do not think the United States allowing us to shift an additional 15 million pounds to the United States will have any real effect on prices in Canada because we have not moved as much beef this year as we did last year. As of June 2, live cattle shipments were up slightly over last year. I suppose that

gives the House a picture of beef movements in and out of Canada.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Communications. I am sure the minister is aware that for years the Saskatchewan government has not allowed liquor advertising in the media in that province. A few weeks ago, the Saskatchewan legislature passed legislation extending that law to cable television. The legislature has not yet had a chance to proclaim the legislation, but last week a representative of the CRTC said that if the legislation is proclaimed, the CRTC will have to step in and do something.

I ask the minister whether she can explain what the CRTC means. Also, could she tell us the government's policy? Is the CRTC planning to step in and, if so, what will it do?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, Saskatchewan has traditionally been opposed to alcohol advertising in the media. The law passed in the last few weeks is legislation regarding the provincial liquor act. That is entirely within provincial jurisdiction. However, some of the amendments apply to broadcasting and that, of course, is not within the jurisdiction of the province but is within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

When the CRTC says it will have to step in if the law is proclaimed and implemented, it means exactly that. The federal government is responsible for content, and advertising is content. However, for the hon. member's information, Mr. Romanow has asked to see me and I am supposed to meet with him in the weeks to come.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is not a contradiction, because it applies now to radio and television advertising in the province, and if it applies to that, why cannot it apply to cable? The Minister of National Health and Welfare has said a number of times that there is a clear policy against promoting the consumption of alcohol in this country. Is there not a contradiction between the policy of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the statement of the CRTC? The statement of the CRTC seems to be promotion of the consumption of alcohol through advertising.

Mrs. Sauvé: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no contradiction. It is true that the CRTC has made adjustments and accommodations for provincial legislation regarding advertising. The CRTC has been able to do that for off-air broadcasting. However, when this would apply in the field of cable we have the problem that cable is the transmission of a foreign signal, and when we are dealing with a foreign signal the same flexibility, obviously, does not exist.