

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

## CHANGE IN RULES GOVERNING MOTIONS AND POINTS OF ORDER

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, on November 13, 1970, during Question Period, a dispute arose over the lack of Cabinet Ministers present to answer questions. After some considerable wrangle the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rose on a point of order and moved that the House proceed to the Orders of the Day. It was acceptable in 1970 to make motions and points of order during Question Period. That practice was discontinued in 1971. I contend that as a result of that discontinuance that particular practice cannot be considered as a precedent.

**Madam Speaker:** Well, I was wondering where the Hon. Member was going with that particular statement under Standing Order 21. I have some doubt about whether this is a proper time to discuss procedural matters.

\* \* \*

## HUMAN RIGHTS

## PLIGHT OF SOVIET DISSIDENT, ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

**Mr. David Smith (Don Valley East):** Madam Speaker, about 15 minutes ago I received a phone call from Avital Shcharansky in New York, the wife of Soviet prisoner of conscience, Anatoly Shcharansky. No member of his family has seen him for 17 months, and during that time he underwent a hunger strike which was widely reported throughout the world press. That hunger strike was finally terminated, but it is generally recognized that he is in very poor health. In a letter which his mother received just a few days ago he described in great detail symptoms which would appear to indicate that he may have suffered a heart attack. Yet he is not receiving medical treatment.

I feel quite strongly about this, Madam Speaker. A meeting with his family, scheduled for June, has been postponed until July. I think it is important while Mr. Gorbachev is in this country that Canadians indicate that these flagrant denials of human rights of people like Mr. Shcharansky and others will not go unnoticed. I call upon him to intervene when he returns to Moscow to allow Mr. Shcharansky to be released and join his wife, whom he has not seen since the day after they were married, in Israel.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

## NATIONAL UNITY

## COEXISTENCE OF FOUNDING RACES

**Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East):** Madam Speaker, since Confederation the national question has been how is the French fact to be accommodated in Canada. Three general

## Oral Questions

possible solutions have evolved through time, resulting from social organization, technological inter-relations, and economic interdependence. These solutions are separation, assimilation, and coexistence.

Various Canadian organizations, political parties, and even some Members of this House, have directly or inadvertently favoured and fuelled the separation option.

Some Canadian organizations, some members in high political office and organizations, and even some Members of this House, are perceived to favour and even promote the assimilation option.

The statesmen, the realists, and the nation-builders have promoted and strived to implement the coexistence option. It is the only acceptable option for most Canadians, and I count myself as one of these, particularly so during the recent constitutional drama. Canada has for several decades moved boldly towards this workable option of coexistence between two founding races, two solitudes, two linguistic and cultural identities. Manitoba is to be applauded and respected for its recent historical action. The nation waits on Ontario for a similar response.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## CANADA DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT CORPORATION

## APPROVAL OF ACQUISITIONS

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue who yesterday tabled one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation to be introduced in Parliament in the past decade, the Canada Development Investment Corporation Bill. The CDIC will be the largest holding company in Canada and a massive intrusion into the marketplace. It will have special privileges that its private sector competitors will not have.

Can the Minister confirm to the House that in fact CDIC, when it decides to buy or sell a company, will not require parliamentary approval and that all it will require is the approval of Cabinet? Can he tell the House why it is he feels the Parliament of Canada should not be required to give its consent before CDIC purchases more companies?

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, I fail to see how the Hon. Member could have concluded from the Bill tabled in the House yesterday that it was the most dangerous piece of legislation he had seen for a long time. Actually, it is a very positive measure, and it is a response to one of the Government's concerns, a concern that