It is my hope that with the larger attendance that we get in the House, and with members having had an opportunity to think the matter over, the result might be different. It has been indicated from the Chair that to try to amend this bill to raise the exemption levels would be out of order, but it was also indicated to us when we were in committee of the whole that we could seek to amend it by reducing any rate of tax, provided we made such a reduction across the board. That is why I proposed in committee of the whole that the rate on the first \$500 of taxable income be reduced from 17 per cent to 2 per cent and that a corresponding reduction of \$75 be made in each of the brackets from the first one up to the top.

I propose to ask the House to vote for a motion that would instruct the committee of the whole to reconsider this proposition. Therefore, I should now like to move my amendment if Your Honour would permit me to do so. I would be happy to continue my remarks when we return to the bill tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member should really wait until the end of his remarks before making his motion. He might want to indicate what his motion would be, but he might find himself in procedural difficulty. The hon. member might indicate his motion and resume his remarks tomorrow. The hon. member has another 30 seconds before adjournment.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I am quite happy to do it that way, Mr. Speaker. At the end of my remarks I shall move:

That Bill C-259 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole House for the purpose of reconsidering the proposed new section 117(1) as set out in clause 1 on pages 313 and 314, and in particular for the purpose of reconsidering the changing of the figure "17%" in line 33 on page 313 to "2%" and consequentially reducing the amount at the beginning of each of the paragraphs (b) to (m), both inclusive, on page 314, by \$75.

Sir, I see it is ten o'clock.

## **PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CANADIAN FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—SHIPMENT OF GOODS THROUGH CANADIAN BROKERS

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this House gave approval to a supplementary estimate with regard to the Canadian International Development Agency for the sum of \$22 million, thus bringing up to \$215 million the amount of money that this country would make available to that agency.

I think all Canadians can take satisfaction from the fact that over the past decade there has been a steady climb in the amount of money that we are making available for international aid. Some of the \$215 million is comprised of economic assistance which includes the provision of commodities, equipment and food, and some of the CIDA Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

program consists of international emergency relief. I am told on what I regard as very reliable authority that any commodity shipments under CIDA are arranged through New York brokers, and that in turn usually means that they go forth on foreign ships. I am enough of a Canadian patriot to imagine that somewhere in this world people who need Canadian assistance would prefer to see that assistance coming to them in a ship that sails under the Canadian flag. Hence my question at the end of November, and a further exchange on December 6, in which the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) replied:

• (10:00 p.m.)

The policy of permitting Canadian funds to be used for ocean shipping is relatively new and to date has only been applied to a few countries. However, in so far as gifts or grants are concerned, the policy is to pass all work possible to Canadian brokers or Canadian forwarders. Further, where the schedules, rates and availability of Canadian-owned shipping companies permit, contracts are awarded to such shipping companies.

It may come as a fearful shock and surprise to you, Mr. Speaker, situated as you are in the city of Cornwall and able to watch the traffic going by your door, so to speak, to learn that Canada has really only two foreign-going freighters at present under the Canadian flag. One is the *Federal Hudson* and the other is the *Global Envoy*. Another vessel which can possibly qualify is the *Cabatern*, which is a clean oil tanker.

The Federal Hudson is now used by the Canadian National system as a car ferry. The Global Envoy is tied up for lack of work at Sorel, Quebec, although I understand it is one of the best equipped ships of its kind registered under the Canadian flag. The Cabatern, the clean oil tanker, is tied up in Toronto with nothing in sight, so that the Canadian foreign-going merchant marine, such as it is, is a somewhat small thing and a somewhat idle thing at the present time. Furthermore, my sources say that they know of no Canadian brokers handling these foreign aid shipments, they know of no Canadian ships carrying them and they would like the government to identify both the brokers and the

It may be noted that we have got out of the carrying business and that our merchant fleet, such as it was during the war, has now shrunk very considerably. So we are not a maritime-minded nation at all although we have one of the longest coastlines in the world. We are rapidly getting out of the manufacturing business and leaving that to other countries. But we are not hewers of wood and carriers of water. The people to whom I have talked about these CIDA shipments are asking exactly what have we become?

I hope that whoever replies will provide some identification of the brokers, some identification of the Canadian ships and the CIDA cargoes that are being carried to other countries. I give notice that I will follow this matter up, since it seems to me to be something that anybody with an ounce of Canadian nationalism in him can develop, when the CIDA estimates come before the external affairs committee next year.

## [Translation]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer

24725-311