

Inquiries of the Ministry

friend the Leader of the Opposition, referring to the fact that a member of the government had admitted that permits were required under the terms of the Navigable Waters Protection Act in respect of the James Bay project, asked the Minister of Transport whether any applications had been received for permits under that act. The minister said he did not believe so but that he would inquire whether any had been made and let the House know. Since the minister has not indicated whether any permits have been issued, I should like to ask the Prime Minister the following question: In light of the provision of the act which says that no work shall be built upon, over, under, through or across any navigable water in the absence of such permission, and in light of the fact that two bridges are presently being built, one across the Bell River and another across the Waswanipi River, can the Prime Minister explain to the House why the government condones this breach of the law and is an accessory to the fact?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question obviously contains statements or allegations. The hon. member asks the Prime Minister why the government condones what he calls a breach of the law. That in itself amounts to a statement. The hon. member might like to rephrase his question.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will rephrase the question and put it in this way: Have applications for permits been received in respect of these two bridges and, if not, will the Prime Minister inquire why these bridges are being allowed to be built, apparently in breach of the law?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must say that this question, in its rephrased form, is the kind of question I like to hear from the opposition, because it genuinely seeks information, something which is rather rare during the question periods. Since the hon. member is genuinely looking for information, I will be very pleased to take notice of the question. I could have done so already had he placed it upon the order paper. But I will gladly take note of it now and refer it personally, or through someone in my office, to the Minister of Transport personally or to someone in his office. We shall do our best to get a good answer to the question and convey the information to the House leader of the very valiant Conservative party.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the Prime Minister give me an answer which is cluttered up by facts?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Selkirk.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

MANPOWER**ON-THE-JOB TRAINING—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NECESSITY FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS AND ACCOUNTING RESPECTING MONEY SPENT ON INDUSTRIAL TRAINING**

Mr. Doug. Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In light of the recent announcement that an additional \$30 million is to be spent on the program for on-the-job training, will the minister undertake to make a statement on motions explaining the necessity for this additional appropriation and the purposes for which it will be used? Could he at the same time present an accounting for the \$40 million which has already been spent on the industrial training program, bearing in mind that no such report has yet been made available to the House?

Hon. Martin P. O'Connell (Acting Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the reason for making additional funds available is very simple and can be explained in a moment. It was done to accommodate the many useful further projects in connection with the on-the-job training program which could be in place by March 31. The number of persons who could be employed on these projects was sufficiently large, and costs were sufficiently low in relation to them, that the government decided to make additional funds available for these projects which must be in operation by March 31.

Mr. Rowland: Perhaps the minister could give consideration to making a statement in response to the second part of my question. In any event, can he inform the House whether any safeguards exist which would ensure that moneys being spent on the industrial training program are being employed for the purpose intended, that of training, and not simply as a means by which employers may reduce labour costs at public expense? If there are such safeguards, what are they?

Mr. O'Connell: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I could refer the hon. member to the regulations concerning the safeguards which are maintained. But I would point out to him that these projects are contracted projects and the employer is obliged to follow the contract which is to put people on the job in training.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS**STEPS TO ASSIST UNEMPLOYED TO RELOCATE**

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the right hon. gentleman's suggestion, as reported in the *Toronto Star*, that Canadians who are out of work could find jobs provided they were willing to relocate elsewhere—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will recognize the hon. member but his question is hardly supplementary to that just put by the hon. member for Selkirk. If there are no supplementaries to that question, I will recognize the hon. member for Edmonton Centre.