

Public Order Act, 1970

It must be readily apparent that it would not be wise to adopt a new general policy to provide for better collection and cold storage facilities, let alone a set level and amount of financial assistance, until we can see where it fits into the general fisheries development policy. The definition of such a policy will incorporate the matter of collection and storage facilities. The prime responsibility of fisheries development, of course, lies with the Department of Fisheries and Forestry. However, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has since its inception had a direct interest in this significant regional economic activity.

Several of DREE's activities are specifically oriented toward the Atlantic coast fishery. Financial assistance is available for new fish processing plants and for the modernization and expansion of existing plants under the Regional Development Incentives Act. Assistance provided under this program since July 1, 1969, amounts to \$1.7 million. The federal-provincial agreements under the fund for regional economic development for northeast New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island also included substantial fisheries development programs. DREE is also contributing in a significant manner to the development and rationalization of the Newfoundland fishery by way of the Newfoundland resettlement program. Again, DREE is at present negotiating renewals of ARDA agreements with the provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret very much that I have to interrupt the hon. member. I must advise the House that the hour set aside for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT 1970****PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER**

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: At five o'clock, the Committee of the Whole was considering clause 15 of Bill C-181, particularly the amendment moved by the hon. member

[Mr. Whelan.]

for Fraser Valley West. The Chair feels it might be useful at this time to read the amendment:

That section 15 be amended by adding the following words as subsection (2):

(2) a Notice of Motion in either House signed by ten members thereof and made in accordance with the rules of that House, praying that an earlier day for the expiry of this act shall be fixed by proclamation, shall be debated in that House at the first convenient opportunity within four sitting days after notice thereof is given,

and renumbering the first paragraph of section 15“(1)”.

The hon. member for York South moved the following subamendment:

That the amendment be amended by adding after the word “given” the words “provided that such a motion should be made only once before April 30, 1971.”

Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that I realize the provision in the bill for the possibility of extending it beyond April 30, 1971, by joint resolution of both Houses of Parliament, and that my subamendment relates only to April 30, 1971. I think it is in order to have it worded that way, for two reasons. First, my mind boggles at the thought of the government asking for an extension of this legislation or at Parliament granting such an extension. Second, a resolution that may become necessary or possible seeking an extension of this bill can contain the discretion of the government to terminate the force of the bill before the date set out in such resolution and can also contain a provision for ten members of the House to be able to place a motion on the table which, if it does not contain such provision, an amendment can be moved at that time. While the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West drew a very important matter to our attention, it does not negate the value of either the amendment, or the subamendment.

I moved my subamendment in response to a challenge from the other side concerning a motion being lodged with the House every day. As I considered it over the dinner hour, I felt that one might have thought of that earlier. It is a good suggestion even though, as I indicated earlier, it will not be necessary. It is a good suggestion that a motion of this kind be moved only once during the first period, and I hope the last, that this bill remains in force. It is a good idea to have that provision.

With that wording in the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether it is possible to persuade the minister to accept it. With the subamendment there is now a limitation of one motion prior to April 30, 1971. If so, all that I said earlier, which I will not repeat, holds true. There is not anything in the bill that is interfered with in any way by this provision. With the safeguard of only one motion written into the amendment, it seems that the minister, the government, members opposite and this House in general should not have the slightest hesitation in providing this extra parliamentary safeguard of a motion moved by ten members of the House. I rose merely to make these comments in support of both the amendment and the subamendment.