

Oral Questions

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I answered that question by the negative, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

● (1432)

[Translation]

MANPOWER**LEGISLATION FORBIDDING CONSTRUCTION WORKERS TO WORK IN OTHER PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. As Ontario is about to give itself an act similar to that of Quebec to prevent real construction workers of other provinces from working in its own, as that will lead to several thousand lay-offs among real construction workers, especially in the national capital region; as those steps by Quebec and Ontario mark the start of the balkanization of Canada and a break in the association of the provinces, does the right hon. Prime Minister intend to submit to the Supreme Court of Canada both the Quebec law and the Ontario bill, when it has been passed, in order to settle once and for all all those unnecessary interprovincial complications which interfere with the sacred right to work of all Canadians, as well as the possibility for the labour force to move from one province to another?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House knows that in its Bill C-60 the government provides specifically for the incorporation into the Human Bill of Rights of a provision guaranteeing all workers freedom of movement from one province to another. If that provision were passed, naturally it would be the ideal solution. Another solution is also possible, Mr. Speaker, that is, that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec agree between them to find a solution to that imbroglio. Unfortunately, they do not seem to have managed that. When they meet, they discuss a thousand and one things, generally pertaining to the federal government, but never seem to solve the problems that exist between them. I have repeatedly offered my services to intervene. If the two provinces were willing to lend me their authority, I could guarantee a solution to that specific problem. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, if they insist in passing laws as they have indicated, and of which the hon. member has reminded us, and if they agree to having them referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, we should willingly make that referral. But they should agree at least on the referral, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

[English]

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**PROPOSED CUTBACK IN PROGRAM—LEVEL OF FUTURE FUNDING**

Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Science and Technology. In view of the proposed across-the-board cuts in expenditures for research and development, particularly in forestry, fishing and agriculture—areas where Canada has a comparable natural trading advantage—does the minister still hold to his objective announced last June of research and development spending equivalent to 1.5 per cent of the gross domestic product by 1983?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, that commitment still remains firm. As I indicated at the time the commitment was made, we are looking primarily to an increase in the industrial sector where Canada has by far its greatest shortfall. We are endeavouring, through means such as tax incentives—and they were announced in the earlier budget by the Minister of Finance—to stimulate and encourage the private sector. Indeed, that commitment remains firm.

Mr. Howie: Mr. Speaker, it is good to hear that despite the fact we are going to spend less, we will spend more. Since the exciting June 1 research and development announcements by the minister, can he indicate to the House if a start has yet been made on any new regional centres of excellence or the innovation centres he announced? Where are they, and when can we expect the regulations constituting the new government procurement policy which is supposed to enhance research and development in Canada?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the hon. member's suggestion that you spend less to get more, in fact when you add the forgone taxes plus the expenditures it is substantially more than any cuts that have in fact taken place.

I will be meeting next week with my counterparts from the provinces to discuss this question of procurement and how we can more effectively use federal government procurement and provincial government procurement to promote and to effectively increase the R and D activities in Canada.

* * *

TRANSPORT**ARBITRARY WITHDRAWAL OF RAIL SERVICE FOR CERTAIN COMMODITIES**

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question arises from the problem which has been affecting the potato industry of eastern Canada as a result of near double-digit inflation over the last few years. During this period, punitive increments in transportation costs have been imposed on that industry. The climax of all this has been proposals by