

review by cabinet as it had been under review by the former government as to the propriety of extending the right of surveillance with respect to the mail. That remains the position.

In the course of that, the Postmaster General was expressing his opinion with respect to it, his opinion on a matter that is still before cabinet. I know that the Prime Minister will be delighted to inform the hon. gentleman of the decision of the cabinet with respect to that position once it has been taken.

**Mr. Blais:** I take it from the reply of the hon. gentleman that the fact that the Postmaster General has taken a diametrically opposed position to that of the Prime Minister is deemed by that government to be completely in order and is to be encouraged.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** The great thing that distinguishes this government from the former government is the ability of members and ministers from time to time to say precisely and correctly what happens to lie on their mind. The Postmaster General has a very strong view with respect to this matter. His view will be taken into consideration, as will be the views of all members on this side of the House with respect to the ultimate government position, and I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman is unused to that, having regard to where he sat for the last five years.

\* \* \*

#### CRIMINAL CODE

##### SUGGESTED AMENDMENT RESPECTING UNBORN CHILDREN

**Mr. Robin Richardson (Beaches):** Mr. Speaker, my question would normally be addressed to the right hon. Prime Minister, but in his absence I will direct it to the Acting Prime Minister and House leader of the party. In view of the almost unanimous support for my motion under Standing Order 43, and also in view of the stated objections of the House leader of the NDP to a much needed reform of private members' legislation, I would ask the Acting Prime Minister if this government would consider bringing in legislation to amend the Criminal Code to protect the unborn child under our law.

**Hon. Walter Baker (President of Privy Council and Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, there has been no discussion in the government with respect to bringing in that kind of legislation. However, I want to inform members of the House that issues such as the one raised by the hon. member—issues which are of great importance to members of this House on all sides—may well have an opportunity to be aired in the House under the proposals for changes in the rules of the House of Commons which will permit greater freedom and greater opportunity for members of the House to decide which, among their particular private members' motions, should be brought to a vote.

I want to inform the House that it is my intention to table tomorrow a position paper outlining a proposal to the House

which would permit the House to make its decisions as to what matters could be brought before the House with much greater precision than they could before. I hope that that provision will meet with the approval of members on all sides of the House.

\* \* \*

#### LOTO CANADA

##### FEDERAL FUNDING

**Mr. Mark Rose (Mission-Port Moody):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport. The minister is undoubtedly aware of the fact that the province of British Columbia has recently demanded that the federal government fulfil its commitment under the Loto Canada agreement and, further, has protested a cutback of federal funding of amateur sports this fall. Therefore, I should like to inquire whether during the Loto Canada transfer discussions an agreement was reached whereby provinces would henceforth deal exclusively with requests for funds by volunteer sports groups?

**Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport and Multiculturalism):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for posing this question. I should like to say to him that we have had continuous discussions regarding the fact that amateur sports should be handled at a certain level by the provinces as well as the federal government. Our negotiations with the province of British Columbia and all other provinces have been very fruitful. We, in turn, will be getting \$24 million in 1979 dollars from the provinces as compared with the so-called \$6 million which we were supposed to get but never got. Our average income from lotteries since 1976, so far as my department is concerned, was around \$3.2 million, and I think members of the previous administration had mentioned we were getting \$6 million. Members can take a look at the books in my department and they will see that we have been given an average of \$3.2 million.

**Mr. Rose:** Apparently, the province of British Columbia is concerned that all requests for funds from the federal government have been turned back to the province, and that seems to be contrary to the agreement. Would the minister agree that when he appears before the parliamentary committee he will be prepared to bring with him for examination Mr. David Jenkins from the Prime Minister's office who negotiated the Loto Canada give away to the provinces in the first place?

**Mr. Paproski:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

\* \* \*

● (1440)

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

##### NINETEEN EIGHTY OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale-High Park):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the right hon. Prime Minister, I should like to