

Oral Questions

Mr. Stanfield: Well, as a former minister of justice and a man who has written with considerable passion on the subject of equality before the law and due process of law, what is the understanding of the Prime Minister now as to the appeal procedure with regard to the anti-inflation program? Is an appeal open, or is it circumscribed, as the Minister of Finance seemed to suggest yesterday?

Mr. Trudeau: When I was minister of justice this law had not been passed, and I would have to take notice of the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ask Castro.

Mr. Stanfield: I am disappointed that the Prime Minister has not been sufficiently interested to ascertain what is going on.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: I do not blame the hon. gentlemen opposite for being a little upset about this question. I would not like to apologize for it either.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY**ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—DATE OF DECISION ON EXPORT LEVY**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister when we may expect some information about the decision of the government regarding the export levy which the Minister of Finance indicated would have been settled last week but could not be settled then because the Prime Minister and part of his cabinet were out of the city? Can the Prime Minister indicate to the House when we may expect a decision of the government on a matter of such vast importance to our export industries, and indeed, to our whole economy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is only with the greatest reluctance that I ever interfere with a question of the Leader of the Opposition; however, I really have no way of seeing a question on export development as supplementary to the original question on the subject of appeals under the statute. Unless there is some connection—

Mr. Stanfield: I accept your ruling, of course, Mr. Speaker. I only entered that field because the Prime Minister did not seem to know anything about the first one I mentioned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Trudeau.]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD**ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR APPEALS—BASIS FOR FEDERAL COURT DECISION IF EVIDENCE ON APPEAL CONFIDENTIAL**

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I was going to pursue this line of questioning with the Prime Minister so he might get some on the job training, but if the Minister of Finance would be kind enough to answer, I will ask him. There is a limited period of time for appeals from decisions of the administrator to the appellate tribunals. As there have been no rules of procedure, no publication of the form of notice of appeal required by the statute, when will this be done so that prospective appellants can know how to comply with the procedure laid down in the act?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has responsibility for convening the tribunal, which has already been established. I would suggest that any party which feels it might like to launch an appeal should do so by addressing itself to the acting chairman.

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question. Foregoing the opportunity to deal with the Minister of Justice, as the Minister of Finance is one of the ancestors of this bill of doubtful parentage, may I ask what assurance he can give to the House that the rules for presentation of evidence and the practice and procedures will be consistent with those of a judicial body in so far as appeal practices are concerned? In particular, as the hearings of the tribunal can be held in camera, on what basis could a federal court—proceedings of which are held in public—give a decision if all the evidence is to be held in confidence?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The federal court would in due course have available the full record of the hearings at the appeal tribunal. In the case of evidence of a confidential nature—as frequently occurs in cases under the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission—it could decide to take certain evidence before it and I presume would do so.

DECISION IN IRVING CASE—POSSIBILITY OF INTERVENTION BY CABINET

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance regarding the decision of the administrator in the case of the Irving Pulp and Paper Company which adversely affects the employees and imposes a heavy financial penalty on the employer. In view of the fact that section 24 of the Anti-Inflation Act empowers cabinet to intervene in respect of the decision of the administrator, may I ask the minister if the government intends to intervene in this matter with a view to re-examining any aspect of the administrator's decision?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I made it clear that I have no intention at this point of recommending to my colleagues that any intervention be taken against this decision. The administrator has obviously given careful attention to these facts, and in particular to the fact that the parties went ahead knowing