

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—ACTION RESPECTING NEW FACILITY

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Transport. Could he tell the House when we may expect an announcement on action in respect of the new Toronto airport?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): A meeting is scheduled with the premier of Ontario for either Thursday or Friday of next week.

An hon. Member: Before or after he resigns?

Mr. Jamieson: A meeting is scheduled for a week from now with whoever is premier of Ontario. The meeting will be held on Thursday or Friday. At that time it is hoped we can agree on an approach to the whole question and soon thereafter, or soon after the necessary studies are completed, it is our intention to make the studies known to the public and have a full discussion at the regional and municipal level before the decision is made.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The time allotted for the question period has now expired. I apologize to the many hon. members who have not had an opportunity to ask questions today. I will look in their direction next Monday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could announce a change in the government business for today. After discussion, it has been decided not to commence with Government Order No. 36 but instead Government Order No. 24, the committee stage of the Temporary Emergency Powers bill.

Mr. McGrath: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Acting Government House Leader this question which is prompted by a genuine concern for my colleague the Minister of Transport. Will today's question period pre-empt the Liberal caucus on Wednesday?

Mr. Reid: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the question period today, which has been far better than it has been in the last three months, would the Speaker consider providing the members on the other side with—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed from Tuesday, November 10, consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public

Public Order Act, 1970

order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The House is again in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada. When the committee rose on Tuesday, November 10, 1970, clause 4 of the bill was under consideration.

Shall clause 4 carry?

On Clause 4—*Offence and Punishment*.

[Translation]

Mr. De Bané: I only wish to make a comment, Mr. Chairman.

According to yesterday's reports, representatives of various Montreal newspapers apparently met to discuss how the regulations, and particularly clause 4, should be interpreted. According to the review published in the papers and particularly in *La Presse*, it seems that all the information media give a different interpretation to clause 4, and particularly to subclause (c).

We know that under clause 14 of the bill under study, section 4 of the regulations is supposed to be incorporated in Bill C-181. I am glad on the one hand, but on the other hand, I am sorry to find that what I said about the vagueness and the many possible interpretations of clause 4 (c) actually turned out to be true, so much so that on the front page of yesterday's issue of *La Presse*, the news editor announced that he would have to reverse his opinion and interpret the act differently, since every news editor, following a general meeting, did not agree on the interpretation. Let me remind you that in the regulations, under 4 (c), you find the words "pour le compte de" while in the press release, the words are "en faveur", and finally in the act, the word is "pour".

I would now like to quote a recent judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada on the importance of the agreement between the two wordings. It is the case of *Tupper vs The Queen*, and in his judgment of June 26, 1967, reported in Vol. II of C.R.N.S. on page 35, Judge Hall stated:

• (12:30 p.m.)

[English]

It can be argued and readily accepted that this may not happen frequently, but it can and may happen if Parliament readily intended what the section says when, without any qualification as to time or circumstance, it put the burden of proof on the person in whose possession any such item may be found.

The interpretation which the wording of the section compels should, I think, be drawn to Parliament's attention.

[Translation]

As for the judge who preceded him—Judge Judson, I believe—he said, and I quote:

[English]

The English version reads: "any instrument for house-breaking"; the French version reads