

Even here in Canada we have our own Bill of Rights. Unfortunately it does not always hold true in practice. In the fields of politics, I would say we have full rights and freedoms. But economically, sad to say, we still have a long way to go. Again last night, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) pointed out in a television interview that almost 25 per cent of all Canadians live below the poverty line in Canada. In other words, Mr. Speaker, for all those people economic rights and freedoms are far from a fact of life. They do not have the right to choose like other Canadians.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, though we boast a Declaration of Human Rights, though we pride ourselves in a fully democratic system, I feel that for that sector of the population democracy does not exist, at least not fully. As we meditate on the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whether in terms of the whole world or our own country, we must take this opportunity to see what remains to be done here in Canada and take the necessary steps to ensure that every Canadian, man or woman, feels completely free, politically and economically, in his or her own homeland.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I realize we have to deal with some questions of privilege, but it would be a great convenience to the House if I could put the question on business which, in the confusion, I could not put yesterday. Perhaps I could direct a question to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen). It is my understanding that there is no difficulty at all as far as the government is concerned about the proposition that the motion standing in the name of my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn), which would have been heard yesterday but for what took place in the House be called today, the last day allotted to the opposition under the rules. I would appreciate confirmation of this.

Later on today we shall be dealing with the appropriation bill. I just want to say to the House leader that it is not our intention to call a vote with respect to that bill. Will he confirm that the situation is as I have stated, and will he also tell us what is to be the business for next week?

Mr. MacEachen: In reply to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) I wish to confirm that there is no difficulty whatsoever from our point of view about proceeding with the motion which in other circumstances would have been dealt with yesterday. I should also like to confirm, for purposes of planning the latter part of the day, the understanding which has been voiced by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton that it is not the intention to have any votes with respect to the supplementary estimates and the ensuing bill.

An hon. Member: Recorded votes.

Mr. MacEachen: There will obviously be no difficulty, I understand, in carrying these items on voice votes, but if it is

the intention to have any votes on division it would be of interest for me to know, so that I could advise my hon. friends.

With respect to the business on Monday, for various reasons it is not possible to call the motion with respect to the Ministry of Economic Development or the other bills I had in mind, Bill C-12, for example, which has been the object of discussion between the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and myself. As a result of those discussions we have decided not to call Bill C-12 at this point. For Monday, therefore, I would like to indicate Bill S-4, legislation respecting non-profit corporations, Bill S-5, the Canada Business Corporations Act amendments, Bill C-13, the Electricity Inspection Act and the Gas Inspection Act amendments, and then the Canada-France trade agreement legislation about which we have had discussions. That is the champagne bill. It is known by that more interesting name rather than by the Canada-France trade agreement legislation.

● (1232)

I ask hon. members to keep in mind the referendum bill and the bill respecting conflicts of interest. It is not my intention to call the referendum bill on Monday, but if we make great progress on the other bills it might be contemplated for Tuesday.

I have received some information since the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question about the McDonald commission, and I would like to confirm that no consideration is being given to changing the terms of reference. I felt that it would be important to get that on the record before being asked outside the House. I might be held in contempt of the House if I answered outside and not here.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the plaintive plea of the Deputy Minister (Mr. MacEachen) for peace of mind with respect to any votes this afternoon. I point out to him that the order paper does not contain any notice of opposed items in the estimates, so there cannot be any votes on individual items, and I give the undertaking that we will not be forcing votes on first, second, or third reading of the supply bill. In that connection, in view of the fact that there may be many members wanting to speak on the motion being proposed today, and since it is clear that there will not be votes called at 4.45, I suggest that the debate go until five o'clock and that we agree to pass the bill at that point.

I noticed in the list of items the minister gave he made particular reference to the fact that Bill C-12 will not be called next week. There is a good deal of interest in this bill, and I take it it can be assumed from the minister's announcement that Bill C-12 will not be put through in December. In other words, the arrangements respecting the Public Service Superannuation Act which now apply will continue to apply in 1979.

Mr. MacEachen: I think I can make it clear that it is not the intention to bring forward Bill C-12 this year. The reason is that it is apparent to me that it could not clear all stages and become law before the end of 1978.