

countries in order to open up new markets for Canadian producers and thereby revitalize Canadian export trade and create new employment opportunities for Canadians.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

CALL FOR REVIEW OF PENALTY FOR MURDER

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Madam Speaker, I would like to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Whereas it has been six and a half years since the abolition of capital punishment in 1976; whereas at that time the penalty for first degree murder was fixed at life imprisonment with no parole for 25 years; whereas that penalty was decided by a close, free vote in Parliament, with 11 persons on death row and strong pressure to increase the use of capital punishment; whereas it is recognized that the mandatory minimum of 25 years is too inflexible, and in some cases counterproductive to rehabilitation; and whereas there is no new rationale to reconsider capital punishment because, first, the rate of murder has declined since 1976; second, capital punishment is not a more effective deterrent to murder, and capital punishment is immoral, irreversible and inequitable in application; I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Dawson):

That the Government set up an independent review group to examine the present penalty for murder and its impact on prisons and prison populations, and to recommend new, more flexible provisions which will protect the public to the greatest extent possible and at the same time provide a greater opportunity for rehabilitation for those serving sentences in prison.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1415)

AIR CANADA

LAY-OFF PROVISIONS FOR EMPLOYEES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Madam Speaker, Air Canada is not acting responsibly or fairly in refusing to offer a voluntary severance pay package to its employees covered by the IAM collective agreement, comparable to that which is being offered surplus Air Canada management

employees. Yet the same economics which makes it advantageous for Air Canada to offer a "golden handshake" to management is surely also applicable to the early retirement of IAM employees, in addition to the fact that such early retirements would also ease the burden of the planned lay-off of 585 IAM employees as of January, 1983. Therefore I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That this House instruct the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) to communicate to the President of Air Canada the desire of all Members of this House that IAM employees of Air Canada should not be discriminated against, should be offered a comparable VSP arrangement, and should not be asked to pay for any such arrangement by giving up other benefits just as management has not had to pay for its "Golden Handshake".

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT WITHDRAW AND SELL ASSETS

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, my questions are directed to the President of the Treasury Board who will know that last year the Government sold its interest in Consolidated Computer to the Corporation for \$100,000 having blown \$125 million of taxpayers' money on that company. Since Nabu has been able to turn that consolidated computer around and make a profit of over \$2.3 million in less than a year, when is the Government going to realize that it cannot run businesses at all and that it would be far better off to sell those businesses it owns, or give them away if necessary, so that the assets could be used to make a profit, put people back to work, and get the country growing again?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I am glad that the Official Opposition is now willing to admit formally that the deal we made with Nabu to extricate ourselves from involvement in the CCI situation was a good one. I am glad the Hon. Member finally recognized that.

With respect to the second part of his question, Government involvement in Crown-owned corporations involves public policy purposes. The important thing is to ensure that those purposes are effectively carried out. In some cases that will mean return of an entity to the private sector, as we intend to do with our shares in the Canada Development Corporation. So it is a matter of properly carrying out what is in the best interests of the public, and this is what we are doing.