

Oral Questions

greatly to allay the fears of the general public of both countries?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we in Canada have when necessary adopted a more restrictive approach to food colour additives than most other countries and the United States. In Canada we recognize only nine of these, whereas I believe other countries recognize as many as 20. May I advise the hon. member that I am advised that the court of appeal yesterday reversed the decision of the court of first instance to do away with red dye No. 2. Red dye No. 2 is at least temporarily again valid in the United States. We asked the FDA of the United States for all its scientific information on the matter. This has been transmitted to my department, and the health protection branch is studying at present the scientific studies which were carried on in the United States. Consultations on this subject this weekend were held with European countries; but we are still of the opinion that, at this stage, it would be premature to ban red dye No. 2.

Mr. Baldwin: I suppose you are an expert on red dye.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

CRITERIA USED TO DETERMINE PRIORITY FOR INMATES IN NEED OF PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Recently one Chris Squires, a twice convicted rapist, took two females hostage at Kingston penitentiary. It is reported that Squires had requested a pass to attend his father's funeral, but was refused; that he had also requested psychiatric treatment, which he was unable to obtain because of his low priority rating. Will the minister tell the House what methods or criteria are used by the Canadian penitentiary system to determine who shall receive priority for psychiatric treatment?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, my information on this inmate is this: He was convicted only recently and had been at the regional reception centre in Ontario, being tested for programs like psychiatric treatment, and so on. On the other hand, we know that he underwent psychiatric treatment in the past. He spent some time at the Penetanguishene institution, in Ontario, and at Kingston psychiatric hospital during his teenage years.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are there criteria relating to priorities for psychiatric treatment, or is the House to assume that treatment is given on the basis of the arbitrary decisions of the officials in an institution? Are there any criteria; if there are, will the minister table the criteria in the House?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are. Actually, two years ago we set up a committee of psychiatric consultants right across the country and asked them to help develop such criteria. They suggested a system of five regional psychiatric centres. We have now built three of those five

[Mr. Mitges.]

centres and will build the other two shortly, one in Saskatoon and one in Halifax. I know there are criteria but cannot give them to the hon. member right now. We will send them to him as soon as possible.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF AMENDING PROVISIONS OF WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE ACT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs? I am not asking the minister today about the proposed legislation respecting veterans who were prisoners of war, because I await with hope the statement he has promised to make on Thursday.

In view of representations made to the government directly by the Royal Canadian Legion, and also made editorially in a recent issue of Legion magazine, calling for the simplification and broadening of the provisions of the War Veterans Allowance Act, may I ask the minister if this act is under review in his department, in the hope that there may be amending legislation some time in 1976?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I also received correspondence from the president of the Canadian Legion. I answered him and told him that, at this time, the possibility of having that legislation for 1976 is not very good.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

● (1500)

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point order. It concerns yesterday's *Hansard* and the Minister of National Defence. At page 10742, the Minister of National Defence declared:

Under the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will table this correspondence, Mr. Speaker.

The minister was referring to a letter from the chairman of Lockheed Aircraft Company which he produced, rather naively I thought, as proof positive that Lockheed would never attempt to bribe a Canadian. The document appears not to have been tabled and I would like an explanation from the minister.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the letter in question was put on the table yesterday.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reluctance to raise a question of privilege which I believe affects my right as a member of this House to ask a supplementary question. Your Honour chose not to allow a supplementary question. For some reason, there seems to be a blind spot in this area. For several days—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. An hon. member close to that area recently raised the same question by way of a point of order. I think all members understand that there is a discretion in the Chair as to whether to allow supplementary questions. The exercise of that discretion may dis-