

Order Paper Questions

EXPORT PERMIT ISSUED TO ZAIRE FOR BUFFALO AIRCRAFT

Question No. 3,953—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Does Zaire hold an export permit for Buffalo aircraft?
2. Is Zaire in default in any loan agreements with the Export Development Corporation?
3. Are export permits being withheld from (a) Zaire (b) other countries and, if so, on what basis?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Export Development Corporation are concerned: 1. On August 25, 1975 a permit to export Buffalo Aircraft to Zaire was issued to a Canadian company. This permit was suspended on January 23, 1976.

2. EDC does not publish particulars of the status of its loans. It is in relation to the borrower and in a sense to the exporter, in a confidential banker's role. Publication may embarrass both parties as well as EDC, and is not in the interest of Canada's trade. If EDC experiences losses, it is of course its responsibility to report those losses to Parliament. An International Monetary Fund study of Zaire is currently taking place.

3. It is presumed that this question refers to Buffalo Aircraft. As indicated in reply (1) the export permit to Zaire has been suspended. There are no other export permits for Buffalo Aircraft to any destination that are currently under suspension.

MEDICAL INFORMATION RELATING TO PERSONS HOLDING FOREIGN AND CANADIAN PILOT LICENCES

Question No. 3,970—**Mr. Nielsen:**

1. Under what condition does the civil aviation personnel licensing section of the Department of Transport forward medical information that pertains to a Canadian citizen who holds both Canadian and foreign pilot licenses to a foreign government department?
2. Is a Canadian citizen notified when a Canadian government department divulges medical history information to a foreign government department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Transport Canada does not as a matter of policy, forward medical information to a foreign government department without the authorization of the licence holder or applicant. However, a statement of medical fitness is provided on occasion to assist a licence holder in obtaining a licence in another state.

2. Transport Canada does not divulge medical history information to a foreign government department, without the authorization and formal release by the licence holder or applicant concerned.

[*English*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in order to correct an answer that I gave the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka when answering his question about vacancy rates. I think I said "common knowledge". I meant that the common objective of all those concerned is to reach the goal of a 4 to 5 per cent vacancy rate.

[Miss Campbell (South Western Nova).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INCOME TAX ACT

REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Faulkner for the third reading of Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, it is just over a year now since Bill C-58 was introduced into the House. I am sure many government members would like to be quick to accuse the opposition of delaying passage of the bill, but before they do so I should like to point out to them that it is the government itself that has been very slow in taking action on the bill. The bill was first introduced, I believe, in January, 1975. We did not see it again until June or July when it was before the House for a short time. Then we did not see it again until December. So lest some government members want to point an accusing finger at the opposition for being slow to adopt this measure, I would suggest politely to them that obviously there are members within the cabinet who are not very anxious to see the bill passed. Otherwise it would have received a much better priority rating within the legislative calendar of the government. Perhaps the opposition is doing some members of the cabinet and some members of the government a favour in continuing to press the government for further explanations concerning the weaknesses of the bill.

When the bill was first presented to parliament I had at least a mild, if not more than mild, interest in it. I am always interested in legislation that has a reasonable and wholesome approach to the repatriation of industry to Canada. I believe the provision in the bill calling for 75 per cent ownership within the year is a little precipitous and does work somewhat of a hardship on the companies concerned. However, obviously this is something we can live with. The companies have already agreed to it, so therefore we can accept it.

When we began second reading, some of the glaring weaknesses of the legislation quickly came to the surface. I realize that not only could I not support the legislation, but that I had vigorously to oppose it. As we began to debate the bill, the government became impatient with the progress we made and invoked closure. At that time it was obvious that the government did not appreciate too close a scrutiny of the legislation, so they invoked closure and moved the bill into committee.

One of the things that was striking, even to the casual observer, at that stage was the changes made in the personnel of the committee. Some of the regulars were no longer there even though they had had a perfect or near perfect attendance in the Committee. They were strangely missing from the committee; and that in itself was disturbing. To find that the government used its majority to adopt a modified version of the guillotine in committee was equally, if not more, disturbing.