

*Canada Evidence Act*

**Mr. Nasserden:** On the point of order—

**Mr. Speaker:** I have just ruled on the point of order.

**Mr. Schreyer:** Could I conclude with a few sentences? I will take but a second. The minister's statement has been vague; it may be unfair to criticize it too much, but it shows, as yet, no evidence of concrete and specific actions to be taken. That is why we are disappointed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, taking into account what you have just said, I will be brief to shorten this debate as much as possible. Besides, I never speak very long at the resolution stage.

This morning the minister moved a resolution which reads in part as follows:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the payment to provinces out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for each fiscal year in the period commencing on the 1st day of April, 1967 and ending on the 31st day of March, 1972, of provincial revenue equalization payments and post-secondary education adjustment payments—

In my opinion, that is just an extension of the equalization payments legislation which concerns mainly the province of Quebec. It is understood that we do not accept the present makeshift, namely the refund of the equalization payments, which we find rather small in any case compared to the amount which the province of Quebec pays in taxes to the federal government. We hope to see the day when the constitution is given its true meaning again. Quebec will then recover its three taxation fields in full and will no longer have to depend on the good will of the federal government for those small equalization payments.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will wait until the bill is introduced when we will certainly have something to say.

[*English*]

**Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat):** Mr. Speaker, briefly commenting on the minister's statement, he has left me puzzled. First he said he was encouraged by the discussions he had had with farm machinery manufacturers; then he tried to justify price increases. I understand that the cost of parts coming in from the United States and the United Kingdom have increased by 3 per cent or 4 per cent; yet the Dominion Bureau of Statistics report says that substantially over 10 per cent more was being charged for these

[Mr. Speaker.]

implements in 1966 than was being charged in 1965.

Would the royal commission looking into this matter make an interim report on this situation? We have no satisfactory explanation why price increases are justified. Those increases ought to be explained. It is all very well to say that costs have increased so much more for labour and so much more for other things, but are those increases justified? The royal commission was set up to investigate this very situation.

In conclusion may I say that farmers are not satisfied with things as they are. We hope there will be some governmental investigation and a report with respect to whether farm machinery companies have been asking for unjustified increases.

### CANADA EVIDENCE ACT

#### AMENDMENTS RESPECTING TAKING OF ADMISSIONS OR CONFESSIONS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-276, to amend the Canada Evidence Act (incriminating statements).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Orlikow:** The purpose of this bill is to amend the Canada Evidence Act to put into that act some of the principles enunciated by the United States Supreme Court in 1966, according to which any admission or confession made while the accused is in custody cannot be used by the prosecution unless it proves that the police warned the suspect that he may remain silent and that anything he says may be held against him; also, that he has the right to have a lawyer present during interrogation.

If the suspect desires a lawyer but cannot afford one he cannot be questioned unless the crown appoints a lawyer and that lawyer is present. If the suspect confesses after receiving the required warning, but without having the benefit of counsel, the burden is on the prosecution to prove a knowing waiver by the accused—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member knows that according to the rules his statement should be brief. I suggest that perhaps brevity is being forgotten this morning.