

Oral Questions

Mr. Jamieson: Because their structure is quite different from ours. I will deal with the hon. member's question, if he wishes to put a supplementary, in just a moment.

Certainly from a personal point of view I have no objection to considering parliamentary representation and I think it would be a good thing. I should add that there is also some question as to whether it will be at the ministerial level, and we are looking into that question as well.

On the second point, yesterday I gave to the chairman of the committee the most recent monitoring process and some background material on the post-Helsinki agreement. I have also said that I would be glad to have members of the committee briefed. At that kind of meeting before the Belgrade conference, I hope we can decide whether we wish to have any kind of resolution of the House or any airing of it in the House, which again I would be quite happy to support.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I appreciate very much the minister's frank and thoughtful answer. I am very interested in this inasmuch as not only will there be U.S. parliamentary participation but, I understand, there will be some European parliamentary groups as well, perhaps, as the minister has indicated, not in the same way because of the different functional set-up of the U.S. Congress and administration. But since there have been a number of useful precedents with respect to parliamentary representation at various U.N. forums, such as the Law of the Sea Conference and UNCTAD and other events, I hope the minister will give serious consideration to an all party representation at this event. But I hope as well that perhaps the minister might indicate whether he would be prepared to see either a reference or some opportunity established for the Committee on External Affairs to meet with him and his officials, both in a formal way and, perhaps if necessary, in an in-camera session, because of the importance of this event not only to parliament but to the Canadian people.

Mr. Jamieson: That was what I was seeking to convey in my last answer. In other words, whatever the committee decides is the most fruitful approach I am prepared to accept by way of briefings and the like. I was not aware there were any parliamentarians planning to attend the conference other than those from the United States. But it may be that this is a more recent development which has come out of discussions which have taken place on the make up of the delegations.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM**PROPOSAL THAT DEPARTMENTS ADVERTISE IN ETHNIC PRESS—
MINISTER'S POSITION**

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Multiculturalism). I refer to a speech made by the former minister in charge of multiculturalism to the Canada Ethnic Press Federation on

[Mr. Paproski.]

March 11, 1977. In his address, the hon. member for Hamilton East indicated the following:

There is agreement that many more government departments should advertise in the ethnic press and media... (and that) this will lead to additional revenues over and above the \$500,000 spent by the multicultural program and the specific campaigns run by such departments as the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Would the minister inform the House whether he is actively promoting this policy among government departments?

Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, this is under active review at the moment by officials of the department and members of the Department of the Secretary of State. It has been followed very closely. An announcement will be made on that, I hope, soon.

Mr. Paproski: My supplementary question is to ask the minister whether he will inform the House what revenues over and above the \$500,000 have been spent on the ethnic press and media advertising to date, and would the minister indicate how much money will be allocated by his department for the ethnic press and media advertising?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The answer to that question can be sought in another way.

* * *

AGRICULTURE**PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE REQUIREMENT THAT
VETERINARIANS INSPECT MEAT—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I think the minister would be the first one to agree with me that animals suffering from diseases should be kept out of the food supply, and to achieve this end inspection of abattoirs must be carried out under close supervision of people trained in the diagnosis of disease, such as veterinarians. In view of this, it has come to my attention that it is proposed to revise the regulations under the Canada Meat Inspection Act to eliminate the requirement that ante-mortem inspection be done by a veterinary inspector and as well eliminate post-mortem inspection by a veterinarian or under the direct supervision of a veterinary inspector. If that is true I would like to ask the minister if he would take whatever action is necessary to stop this proposed revision before irreversible actions are taken that will adversely affect our ability to assure the public of a continuing wholesome and disease-free meat supply.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I will check that to make doubly sure that nothing is being done to lower the high standard of inspection which we provide for meat products in Canada. I do know that there has been some discussion about training technicians. We do use many highly