

Paper

[English]

FINANCE

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF CIRCUMSTANCES
SURROUNDING DECLINE OF DOLLAR—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent necessity. Although the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) has stated that the Governor of the Bank of Canada is not intervening in foreign exchange markets and that the public will not know the day to day fall in our exchange reserves, his own department has published figures today which show our foreign exchange reserves have fallen \$605.5 million in one month, confirming earlier estimates. In view of this precarious state of our currency, temporarily stabilized by foreigners financing purchases of Canadian grain, and in view of the minister's misleading and contradictory statements about our exchange position, I move, seconded by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie):

● (1412)

That this House refer the matter of our declining dollar to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and that that Committee be instructed to report on the adequacy of our foreign exchange reserves, the reason for their decline to an all time low in relation to our trade deficit, the reason why new 'stand-by' credits were arranged with private banks when there are already lines of credit available from other countries' Central Banks, and in particular, the terms of the stand-by arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: This motion under the provision of Standing Order 43 requires unanimous consent for presentation. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

INDUSTRY

REQUEST FOR TARIFF PROTECTION FOR PAPER AND BOXBOARD
MANUFACTURERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. Since 80 per cent of Canada's paper industry is not protected by duties and Canadian boxboard mills cannot compete with mills in the United States because the Canadian government does not provide comparable conditions with regard to taxation, transportation, machinery and equipment costs and export incentives, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That the Minister of Finance ask our representatives in the Tokyo round of GATT negotiations now in progress, to protect the Canadian paper and boxboard industry against unfair exposure to market conditions which could be ruinous to this industry and the jobs of its employees.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 43 such motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: No!

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

MANDATE OF SECURITY SERVICE PRIOR TO MARCH, 1975—
PERSON AUTHORIZING OPERATIONS AND REPORTING
PROVISION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister who I am pleased to welcome back to the House of Commons. On Friday the Solicitor General indicated that the Cabinet on March 27, 1975 defined the mandate of the security services. The Prime Minister will recall that those illegal offences of which the House of Commons has been informed to date occurred before that definition of the mandate. Will the Prime Minister tell the House what the mandate of the security services was prior to March 27, 1975 and specifically did that mandate, prior to March 1975, deal with the question of illegal activities and what instructions were given to the security services in regard to illegal activities?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the mandate which was that of the security services before the date of the giving of those guidelines to the RCMP, was the traditional mandate carried out by the RCMP under previous governments to mine. As far as I know, they go back as far as the RCMP has existed. We have not been able to find specific guidelines parallel to the ones we issued in March. The reason some were issued in March, 1975 was that at that time we realized the RCMP had been investigating a legal political party. They were asking us for guidance in terms of what they should be doing in order to best protect the security of the country. We indicated to them that the answer would be contained in these guidelines. There was nothing in the guidelines, of course, authorizing any illegal act, nor do I believe the common-law guidelines existing before the general mandate given to the RCMP security services under the RCMP Act has ever referred to the fact that the RCMP could commit any illegalities. It was not found necessary by my government, or by I think any previous government, to indicate to the police that they could not act illegally.

Mr. Clark: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell the House who, prior to the March, 1975 guidelines had the ultimate authority to authorize security operations and what provisions existed for reporting upon those security operations to either the Prime Minister or the Solicitor General? Further, what actions did the Prime Minister take to satisfy himself that no illegal activities were undertaken?