

The Constitution

2. (a) How many government agencies and Crown corporations are included (b) what are their names and the number of staff in each agency?

3. (a) How many separate federal establishments house such agencies (b) at what addresses are the establishments located (c) how many of the establishments are owned outright by the government and where are they located (d) how many are leased, rented or otherwise occupied on a non-ownership basis and where are they located?

4. (a) What was the total rent, lease or other non-ownership payment made in the area by the government in the past fiscal year (b) who were the recipients of the payments (c) what amount is projected or estimated for the current fiscal year?

5. What are the grants in lieu of taxes that are paid by the government on the buildings and land?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Collette: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, for some time now I have been asking the parliamentary secretary whether we could have an answer to question No. 811. It is a very important question at this time when the government is having to deal with its deficit financing position; it has to do with the expenditure of public funds. Could the parliamentary secretary please answer question No. 811 because it has been on the Order Paper since May 8, 1980?

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, I have given the hon. member my assurance that I will be trying to get this answer tabled as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

THE CONSTITUTION

RESOLUTION RESPECTING CONSTITUTION ACT, 1981

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Roberts, for an Address to Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada.

And on the amendment of Mr. Epp, seconded by Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton)—That the motion be amended in Schedule B of the proposed resolution by deleting Clause 46, and by making all necessary changes to the Schedule consequential thereto.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, when I rose to speak last Thursday evening at nine o'clock, I just had a few moments in which to make my introductory remarks. Therefore, I will proceed now without reviewing the comments I made at that time because I have much ground to cover.

I have been a member of this House for the past 23 years and every day before the public is admitted to the gallery, we rise in our places and begin our proceedings with a prayer. That prayer is indicative of the spirit of our country; until now we have recognized the supremacy of God in Canada and the value the family has in our society. The proposed Constitution—if it is to be a new Constitution, and I am told this is the planning for the future—indicates the direction this country is going to take is not one where the supremacy of God will be recognized. In other words, there is no reference to that supremacy.

The other day the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) tried to explain why he is supporting the Liberal government, the government of the day, without reference to the supremacy of God. He said that when the Diefenbaker bill of rights was introduced in 1960, there was no reference to the supremacy of God, and when it went to the committee, that provision was not in the bill. I was a member of the House at that time and it was my privilege to be part of some of the committee work. I know what transpired. I wish to correct the impression left by the hon. member for Burnaby that it was a Liberal member of the House who introduced an amendment which allowed for the preamble to include a reference to God. The Liberal members applauded that statement. It was information they had not had up until that time, and they applauded.

● (1510)

I want to correct that error. The hon. member said we should dig into history. The history is this. The then minister of justice, Mr. Fulton, was concerned about the wording of the preamble. Because it was so important, he wanted members from all sides of the House to participate in drafting the wording of the bill. I looked up the reference. At page 7411 of *Hansard* for August 2, 1960, the then member for Essex East, Paul Martin, said this:

First of all, there is stated in the bill that the Canadian nation is founded on principles which acknowledge the supremacy of God.

He was chastising the then minister of justice. He stated that he had learned, when the suggestion was first made on second reading, that it was ridiculed by the minister of justice in his usual manner of playing politics. Mr. Fulton replied:

Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. What I was talking about was poetic language. No specific objection was taken to a preamble.

In other words, he was not opposing including the supremacy of God in the preamble. At page 590 of the committee report for 1960, he wanted to make it clear that he had no objection to including a reference to the supremacy of God. He said:

I know we have all been working on a preamble.

In other words, there was an invitation from the chairman to all members to write out a preamble. He stated that all suggestions would be considered at the time the preamble was drafted. On the same page, Mr. Martin is quoted as saying:

It seems to me that the suggestion of the minister that a committee be appointed to consider various suggestions was a wise one.