

speech indicates that things are relatively bad and absolutely terrible, in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacKay: People are concerned as well about another very basic failure of the government, and I speak parochially here so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, because we are not getting any proper joint federal-provincial initiatives in agriculture. In Nova Scotia 80 per cent of all the food we use is imported. Clearly this is most unsatisfactory. Feed grains is an area where we can be more independent but, according to Mr. Charles Hubbard, president of the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture, little research is being done in this area.

The Nova Scotia government has flatly stated that the federal government's 1977 dairy program, which put a 25 cent per hundredweight levy on fluid milk, will cost the Nova Scotia dairy industry \$700,000, and reduce the individual dairy farmer's income by approximately \$1,000 a year. The levy is clearly too high, and we believe that we should have a long term dairy policy. There should be no necessity for the raising and lowering of quotas buffeting farmers around at the government's whim. This is exactly what has been going on.

The fishing industry in Nova Scotia has not shown any signs of being revived, despite the 200 mile limit that this country finally put in effect at the same time as did the United States.

Again speaking about my constituency, which is a very important priority so far as I am concerned, I do not see any indication that badly needed bait freezing storage and facilities are being installed federally, provincially, or on a joint basis. I do not see any initiative to improve things in this industry, and this is another thing that is disappointing to me because the Speech from the Throne does not contain any mention of fish so far as I have been able to discover, despite the fact that this industry was one of the reasons why this country was discovered, and still is one of our greatest natural resources.

I say, let us get back to basics in running the country; let us pay attention to developing our fisheries. There are only 800,000 people in Nova Scotia and with some intelligence and the development of primary industries—we would not need large industrial projects—we could get along very well with our fishing, our farming, and our forestry. Yet there appears to be no leadership emanating federally or provincially in this important endeavour for our province.

Another point that I wish to make in the context of this debate is with regard to the fears that Canadians have been expressing about what is happening to some of our national institutions. It has not been a pretty sight to see some of the things that have come to light about AECL, Polysar, National Revenue, Statistics Canada and some of the other agencies that were noted in the past for their integrity.

For example, anyone who has been following the proceedings of the Laycraft Commission of Inquiry and has followed the cross-examination of a man by the name of Edmond Swartzack, an official of National Revenue, the cross-examination by Mr. Pitfield, counsel for RAS, and the cross-exami-

The Address—Mr. MacKay

nation by Mr. Berger, counsel for Mr. Justice Laycraft, is struck by the evasiveness and by how perilously close to perjury this man has come. The contention made in the Chamber and elsewhere by representatives of this government that this agreement between Revenue Canada and the RCMP was perfectly legitimate, and not secret, does not stand the test of logic. How in the world, for example, could the chief law enforcement officer of the province of Alberta know enough to make inquiries about this agreement if he did not even know of its existence? How is it that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), an erudite man, could say here in the House of Commons that if we want to know the definition of organized crime, for purposes of this agreement, we should refer to a statute that was only passed a short time ago when this agreement, which did not even define organized crime which it was supposed to combat, was put together in 1972? I just do not understand the basic logic exhibited by the government in not co-operating fully with provincial royal commissions.

Another thing that I think will have to be faced pretty soon is what we are going to do about this inequitable section of the Federal Court Act 41(2), which I and other hon. members have discussed at various times with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Mr. Justice Deschênes of the Quebec Superior Court dealt with this in a very erudite and scathing way last year when he was discussing the case of a couple of young girls from Quebec in whom the Quebec Civil Rights Association showed some interest. They took their case to the Federal Court to find out why these girls were discharged from their jobs. Once again section 41(2) was brought down and frustrated the attempts of these young ladies to find out the truth. In the Laycraft Commission of Inquiry it has been used, and it has been used in other inquiries. It has been used over and over again, but what is the basis for it? If the Americans had this type of legislation, I submit they would never have been able to get to the bottom of their difficulties in Watergate. Just listen to this section in the act. It reads:

When a minister of the Crown certifies to any court by affidavit that the production or discovery of a document or its contents would be injurious to international relations—

That is a very curious thing in relation to a couple of Quebecoise. It continues:

—national defence—

That is incongruous too, for two girls!

—or security, or to federal-provincial relations, or that it would disclose a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, discovery and production shall be refused without any examination of the document by the court.

That is the basic keynote, or principle, by the court! Why should a cabinet minister of any government substitute his judgment, biased as it must inevitably be by political persuasion and self-preservation, for that of a Justice in the Federal Court of Canada? The only mandate of a judge is to do the right thing for society. Politicians cannot always do the right thing because of all the political pressures. Lawyers cannot always do the right thing either, as we all know, but a judge is supposed to do the right thing. That is his job, his mandate. Why must we have the situation where even an acting minis-