

that question and, if so, what was the nature of the conversation and the result of it?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the question was put to me by the hon. member for Calgary North I have had conversations with the Minister of Justice of Quebec. Indeed, again this morning I expressed to him my deep concern at allegations of mistreatment by the police of certain people detained under the regulations promulgated pursuant to the War Measures Act.

I also talked to Mr. Jacques Hebert this morning, who is chairman of the three-man commission appointed by the Attorney General of Quebec to review the conditions of detention of those held under the War Measures Act. I was advised by Mr. Hebert that during the initial few days of the current crisis just after the proclamation of the War Measures Act, when over 350 people had been arrested at one time, there appeared to have been five or six cases of rough handling of accused persons by the arrested at one time, there appeared to have been five or six people of prolonged interrogation. All these alleged incidents, according to Mr. Hebert, apparently took place during the first few days following the proclamation of the War Measures Act when the wide arrests were made.

Mr. Hebert has personally assured me that no obstacles are being placed in the way of his committee, that they have been able to interview any detained person they wish to interview. Every complaint has been transmitted by Mr. Hebert and his committee to Mr. Louis Marceau, the protecteur du peuple, the Quebec ombudsman established under the laws of Quebec. The Attorney General of Quebec advised me this morning that he had authorized Mr. Hebert's committee to have complete access to all persons detained and that it was open to the Quebec ombudsman, who also has complete access, to suggest what indemnity should be paid or what other remedial steps should be taken in the case of anyone who has been unfairly treated.

I have also been advised by the Attorney General of Quebec that the disciplinary committee of the Quebec Provincial Police is investigating any allegations of rough treatment, and I am assured by the Attorney General of Quebec that the proper action will be taken.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME—OLD AGE PENSION COST OF LIVING BONUS—CHANGES IN CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister arising out of the income security report which has just been tabled by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Since chapter 6 of this report seems to be concerned mainly with giving some of the reasons for not implementing a guaranteed annual income, and in view of the statements that have been made by Dr. Willard,

Inquiries of the Ministry

Deputy Minister of the department, before the Senate committee, and the majority opinion expressed by the Liberal policy convention the weekend before last favouring a guaranteed annual income, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government would be prepared to reconsider the whole question of the guaranteed income as being basic to a genuine frontal attack upon the problem of poverty in this country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed as regards Dr. Willard that the leader of the New Democratic Party is quoting him very inaccurately; therefore I cannot deal with that allegation.

The other allegation concerning the position of the Liberal delegates at the policy convention two weeks ago I must deal with by stating that at that time they did not have this detailed argument before them. We knew, of course, what the argument would be, and that is why I suggested to them that they study the white paper with an open mind. I know they will do that, but I also hope that the members of the opposition will, though perhaps this is too much to ask.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the government has already provided for a cost of living bonus in the pensions paid to former civil servants and former employees of some agencies of the Crown, the armed forces and Members of Parliament and Senators, would the government be prepared to reconsider its decision with respect to discontinuing the cost of living bonus for those who are on the old age security pension? The cost to the government would be relatively small, \$14 million or \$15 million a year, and in addition it would seem that one group of pensioners is being discriminated against in face of the treatment meted out to other pensioners who come within the purview of the federal government.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of publishing a white paper is in order that all these questions be placed in context. We did, of course, consider the alternative suggested by the leader of the New Democratic Party, but we did not accept it because we thought it was more important to help the poor, as we do, than to help the rich, as he is suggesting. The white paper is there and the whole context is now available not only to members of the House of Commons but to the Canadian public. We will therefore wait for discussion of the white paper.

I must say that if it should be the desire of the country to accept the recommendation of the New Democratic Party leader, I hope at the same time they will indicate which taxes should be increased in order to finance this.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a final supplementary. I am sure the country will be pleased to know that the Prime Minister thinks that anybody receiving more than \$140 a month is rich. May I ask a question about the Canada Pension Plan. As pointed out in the report, the federal government must give three years' notice to the provinces of any proposed change. In view of the fact that the provinces do not contribute but have the benefit of access to