

*Public Order Act, 1970***EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING BRITISH POLICY ON SALE OF ARMS TO SOUTH AFRICA**

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister inform the House if it is the intention of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to advise the British government with respect to the conduct of its policy on arms sales to South Africa on his scheduled visit to London commencing November 26, 1970?

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Canadian government's position on that matter is well known, and on his next trip to London, the Secretary of State for External Affairs will certainly restate the government's view.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE**LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT TERMINATION NOTICE TO SURPLUS WORKERS**

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In light of statements made in this House by his predecessor that employees of Canadian Forces Bases who had been declared surplus as a result of base closures would receive six months notice before employment was terminated, can the minister give the House an assurance that this policy is still in effect?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I will have to make inquiries to see specifically what the hon. member is driving at.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970****PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER**

The House resumed from Monday, November 23, 1970, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) for the third reading of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands had between 30 and 60 seconds left to his credit when we adjourned last evening.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was pointing out to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that it was not good enough for him to be attending seminars and meetings of

[Mr. Baldwin.]

law societies to declaim about individual liberty and civil rights. He has an opportunity now to demonstrate that this is not mere empty rhetoric.

When the debate began the minister accused some of us in this corner of shrieking for our political lives. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is something worse than shrieking for your political life and that is shirking for your political life. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made it perfectly clear yesterday that the only reason the government is not agreeing to the setting up of a tribunal to ensure that there may be no abuse of the powers granted by Parliament is that the government of Quebec, and particularly the attorney general of Quebec, wants these extraordinary powers without any safeguards.

The position taken by the Minister of Justice demonstrates clearly that the man who has been held out as the Prince Valiant of the Liberal party now stands revealed as the spineless wonder of the just society.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As we adjourned last evening, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands had just moved an amendment to the motion that Bill C-181 be read a third time, proposing that the bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of reconsidering clause 12 with a view to the inclusion therein of a provision for the establishment of an independent body to review the administration under the said bill.

I indicated I had some reservations about the regularity of this amendment. I should immediately put the hon. member's mind at ease and assure him that, although I still have serious reservations about the procedural aspect of the proposed amendment, I will put it to the House so that hon. members may have an opportunity to debate it and in due course, vote on it. Similar amendments were debated at length in Committee of the Whole House in relation to clause 12 and to clause 14 of the bill; I would think it would be the wish of the House that similar latitude be allowed at this stage of proceedings. A bill such as this one, which deals with individual rights and fundamental freedoms, should be discussed as freely as possible and should be given the benefit of the liberal interpretation of the rules and precedents.

As hon. members know, debate on third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill. This principle is enounced in May's 17th edition at page 572. May states further that reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible. Citation 418 of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads as follows:

All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill.

At the third reading stage a motion is always in order to refer the bill back to a committee for the purpose of reconsidering any clause thereof. It is doubtful, however,