

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Jelinek:** Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1976, the then solicitor general of Canada very clearly stated in the House of Commons that the government, as well as the RCMP, were well aware of KGB activities taking place right under our noses and that it was the policy of the government to allow these people to continue to operate in such an event. In view of the minister's answer now, can we take it that the new policy of the government is not to allow into Canada any individuals known to have espionage training with the KGB, and to get rid of any agents who are currently operating in Canada, whether it be in Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto or elsewhere? Is this the new policy of the government?

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, the policy was clearly stated last week by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

SEVERING OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH COUNTRIES  
GUILTY OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN CANADA—GOVERNMENT  
POSITION

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can receive assurances from the Acting Prime Minister, rather than the Minister of Justice. He may be a bit more realistic. Can we have assurances from the government that should foreign countries continue to practice terrorist or subversive activities in Canada or, for that matter, any illegal actions such as the importation of arms from Cuba, diplomatic relations will be terminated on a temporary basis with countries which do not respect the laws of our land?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I realize the seriousness of the points made in the hon. member's question, but certainly I cannot give an undertaking that in every case we would terminate diplomatic relations with the country involved. An incident occurred not too long ago which was brought to the attention of the House by the minister. It is not our intention to terminate relations with that country but to attempt to build for the future and maintain relations with the country concerned.

\* \* \*

● (1422)

ENERGY

NORTHERN PIPELINE—REQUEST SECOND READING OF BILL  
DELAYED UNTIL PIPE SIZE KNOWN

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister. The Deputy Prime Minister's sombre exercise in deception last night on television reiterated the truth that the Alcan pipeline proposal will be the largest construction project of its kind in Canadian history. Considering that the National Energy Board has not yet made the crucial decision on what kind of pipe is to be used, and since that is central to the question of Canadian jobs, would the Deputy Prime Minister reconsider the government's position and not proceed with second reading of the

[Mr. Basford.]

pipeline bill today? It would be an affront to parliament to ask us to make a decision on the pipeline well in advance of knowing what kind of pipe will be used.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is under a misapprehension, because the House will not be asked to make a decision on the pipeline prior to receiving this information. The House will be asked to debate at second reading the many other issues involved in the pipeline. As I indicated last week, in order to meet the general concern expressed by the hon. member, I will ensure that the bill does not come to a decision at second reading until this information becomes available to hon. members. No decision is being called for before hon. members have that information.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister has gone beyond the usual bounds of Liberal sophistry: he says we will not have to make a decision on the kind of pipe that is going to be used, in reaching a decision on this bill. Does the Deputy Prime Minister really believe that we can have a serious debate at second reading, in which principal spokesmen for all political parties, presumably, will commit themselves one way or another, before we know what kind of pipe will go into the pipeline and, therefore, before we know whether Canadians are going to get the jobs to which they are entitled from this project?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is possible for hon. members on both sides of the House to debate many principles of the bill.

**Mr. Broadbent:** But not the essence of it.

**Mr. MacEachen:** In fact, if one were to take a procedural point of view, the point to which the hon. member is referring would generally be dealt with at the committee stage. However, I am not making very much of a point of that because I believe it will be very possible to deal with the principles of this bill at second reading without this information. I have assured the hon. member, because that was the concern expressed in his first question, that he will not be asked to make a decision at second reading until he has this information. I undertake that the bill will not come forward for a decision at second reading until the hon. member has that information. I believe that is an accommodation which ought to be satisfactory, in the circumstances.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Surely the Deputy Prime Minister knows that we cannot proceed with a number of days' debate on the bill without knowing whether we are going to have the kind of pipe which is absolutely essential from the point of view of Canadian interests. However, it is clear that the Deputy Prime Minister has no intention of changing the government's position on that matter.

Is the real reason we are proceeding with the bill today, instead of a week from today when we will have the requisite information, due to the fact that just down the street the Prime Minister is having a conference with all the provincial