

what are absolutely all details including the (a) amounts spent (b) exact location (c) purpose?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No.

#### NURSING SHORTAGE AT SAINT JOHN GENERAL HOSPITAL

Question No. 2,770—**Mr. Landers:**

With respect to the nursing crisis at the Saint John General Hospital in Saint John, New Brunswick, what does the Minister of Manpower and Immigration intend to do to alleviate the nursing shortage in Saint John-Lancaster?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Officers of my Department met with representatives of the Saint John General Hospital on Tuesday, June 17 to consider action to solve these problems. In the short-term we expect to admit for six months up to 45 non-immigrant nurses for the Saint John General Hospital and ten non-immigrant nurses each for two other Saint John hospitals. Some prospective non-immigrant nurses are now residing in the State of Michigan and may be admitted to Canada if they meet normal immigration criteria and are likely ultimately to pass the examination of the New Brunswick Association of Registered Nurses. Our Detroit office has scheduled the prospective Filipino nurses for interview on June 20. A medium-term solution will likely involve the hospitals and my Department in the recruitment of qualified prospective immigrants. A long-term solution should involve the Provincial Government and the hospitals in a review of training needs and facilities and in the negotiation of competitive wage rates.

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) on a point of order.

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the parliamentary secretary, who just answered questions, if notice of motion No. 38, that has been on the order paper since March 26, 1975, will receive special attention and if I may hope to have an answer very soon, since the budget debate is in progress and the questions raised in that notice also have special relevancy to the budget debate.

● (1210)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### THE BUDGET

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stevens (p. 7063).

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson).

**Mr. Malone:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

#### The Budget—Mr. Malone

**Mr. Paproski:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone) still has a few minutes left of his speech. I do not think he had finished.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member for Battle River has four or five minutes left; I forget the exact time.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member was, of course, speaking to the subamendment yesterday on which debate was concluded by the taking of the vote last night. That is the situation he is in. Where a member has a few remarks to make to conclude his speech, it would require, I would think, the unanimous consent of the House for him to conclude those remarks at the present time. If there is some assurance that the hon. member has only a few minutes left, I would ask the House whether it gives unanimous consent to the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone) being given the opportunity to conclude his remarks.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Battle River.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I express my appreciation to the House for extending me a few moments to add a few comments at this time. Last night I was enthusiastically chastising the government for their grab-and-run budget; the vote was then called and by 24 votes we find we are still here this morning, haunted by the same budget. If hon. members opposite take any gratification from this, it is only because the vote was taken here and not in the country. The fact of the matter is that if it had been taken there, we would have had a very different response.

I should like to take a very few minutes at this time to give representation to what I think ought to be included in the budgetary considerations as the government reviews the budget and makes adjustments to any future budgets. I should like to put on the record something that I think is an extremely important problem to the Canadian people, and it relates to fires and deaths associated with fires in this country. In the year 1974, 725 persons in this country died from fires. But what is interesting is that seven out of ten of these deaths were people who lived in single or dual family dwellings. The important thing I want to stress is that we make it mandatory in this country to have fire protection equipment in institutions, hotels and apartment buildings, yet we have no such regulations for homes. It is of interest to note that this equipment is a tax write-off for institutions but there is no such tax write-off for individual home owners.

The National Research Council of Canada estimates that smoke detectors would have saved 41 per cent of lives lost in fires between the years 1956 and 1960. Had we had smoke detection equipment in homes across Canada, this would have meant the equivalent of saving 200 Canadian lives during that period. Across the last decade the number of deaths and the amount of dollars lost by way of property damage have indeed been extremely high and the rate has been increasing. The total number of residential