

Shipping

matter if it had not bothered to look into it in some depth, and in respect of which it had not prepared positions or papers. I still think that kicking around in the cobwebs of the UN or somewhere else are our papers pertaining to this.

My immediate concern relates to the development of a deep sea fleet to move goods in and out of Canada. I am not particularly interested in whether we do it uniquely or solely under the liner conference. I am aware that we do not carry all our goods in that particular way. I am also aware of the liberalization code and have some feeling in respect of it. I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that part of our concern is that we should become more keenly involved in, and develop a firm position, on the part of the government, parliament and Canadians, on Canada becoming involved in the deep sea and offshore business even if we do so through the liner conference, because if that should provide a rationalization for direct government entry into such movement then I am not prepared to dismiss that.

The Canadian Labour Congress, at its last meeting I believe, discussed this and suggested that the need was so important that perhaps the government should consider direct involvement. I am not prepared to dismiss that out of hand. I am particularly concerned because time is becoming a very critical element with regard to the movement of our extractive resources in the north.

If we do not develop our own capability then both the financial resource, the northern engineering and the maritime resource will be developed by the large cargo carrying vessels which operate in the north, and we will be precluded from operating there and will have lost yet another opportunity for Canadians. In the last five years alone, for what it is worth, we have been running some \$3,684,000,000, in lost revenue in Canadian payments to non-residents with regard to freight and shipping charges on imports. That is a tremendous amount of money. In addition to that, of course, there is all the money we could have spent on a shipyard industry, and so on.

I am satisfied with the explanation of the parliamentary secretary on why there might be particular papers, studies, memoranda, or notes which could directly relate to the wording of my question. On that basis I would seek leave of the House for the purpose of withdrawing my motion with the final caveat that I reserve the right to introduce it in other words.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Pursuant to the order made in this sitting, the House will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 21.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

LETTER FROM MINISTER OF JUSTICE TO SECRETARY OF STATE RESPECTING GRANT TO WOMEN'S GROUP

The House resumed, from Thursday, April 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fairweather:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a letter written by the Minister of Justice to the Secretary of State, dated October 21, 1974, about a grant to a women's group in Saskatoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): For all intents and purposes the time provided under section 2 of Standing Order 48 for the consideration of this motion has now expired, but I would point out that the Standing Order also permits a 15-minute participation in the debate by a minister of the Crown, and an additional five minutes for the mover of the motion, after which the Chair is bound to put the question.

[Translation]

I would like to remind the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) that it has been said that only a minister or the sponsor of the motion may have the floor at this time, unless there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): There is unanimous consent. The hon. member for Lapointe has the floor.

● (1730)

Mr. Gilles Marceau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Justice opposed the motion for production of copy of a letter he addressed, on October 21, 1974, to the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) concerning a subsidy to a group of women in Saskatoon because, as the custom would have it, the recommendations of the legal advisers of the Crown on government policy matters being included under confidential matters, their release has usually been refused. In this regard, I refer to May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, page 272, and Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, page 338. That guide line on notice of motions for production of papers was enunciated by the government and published as an appendix to *Hansard* on March 15, 1973 (page 2288). The fact that, in this case, part of the documents containing that ruling may have been made available to the media does not constitute a valid reason for breaking the tradition that requires such confidential documents not to be released. If documents of that nature were subject to disclosure, the freedom of expression and frankness that are essential to the proper management of state affairs would be seriously jeopardized, and the exercise of guiding the ministers of the Crown would be paralyzed.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): I would remind the House that if the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) speaks at this time he will close the debate.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Madam Speaker, I will not use the five minutes which the rules allow me. I am one of those who do not mind breaking with tradition, and I am rather surprised that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mar-