

## SALE OF WEATHER SHIPS "VANCOUVER" AND "QUADRA"

Question No. 4,596—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Were the former weather ships *Vancouver* and *Quadra* sold by the Government and, if so, in each case (a) at what price (b) what was the original price (c) what is its age (d) was the purchaser a Canadian (e) was the payment entirely in cash or were there credit arrangements?

2. Were any restrictions, such as the re-sale to foreign countries, placed on the possible future use for the ships?

3. Was the sale properly advertised and, if so, were the ships sold to the highest bidder?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of Supply and Services):** I am informed by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation as follows:

1. Yes, the weather ships *Vancouver* and *Quadra* were sold by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation. (a) Individual price for the weatherships is not available since the ships were sold as a package for the amount of \$645,000, (b) *Vancouver* (\$14,447,902); *Quadra* (\$14,316,090), (c) *Vancouver* (built in 1966); *Quadra* (built in 1967), (d) No, (e) Payment was entirely in cash.

2. No.

3. The sale was advertised in the following newspapers and publications: *The Globe and Mail*, *Financial Times*, *Les Affaires*, *The Shipping World*, *Maritimes Reporter and Engineering News*.

In addition, offers to purchase were sent to over 5,000 prospective purchasers. The ships were sold to the highest bidder.

[English]

**Mr. Smith:** I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Translation]

**Madam Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[English]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Nielsen:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to House business. I notice that the report of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs was tabled today, thus allowing the House to be seized of Bill C-131, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act.

Could the Government House Leader give us an indication, since we will be dealing with Bill C-132 today, when we might expect to be dealing with Bill C-131?

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, I announced yesterday that we would be dealing with Bill C-132 today and Monday. There is no change for the time being, even if Bill C-131 has been reported today. If I were to change my mind, I would let

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

Hon. Members know in due time. We will be dealing with Bill C-132 today and again on Monday. It will be followed by Bill C-131.

● (1220)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

## MEASURE TO LIMIT INDEXATION

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-132, to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West)** moved:

That Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 14 to 17 at page 1.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is best to begin today by explaining to Members the purpose and intent of the amendment which I have moved. This Party is convinced that the Bill to put a 6 and 5 per cent capping on the Family Allowance is wrong because it is punitive to that segment of Canadian society—children—who are least able to defend themselves. It is our intention as a Party, if forced to it, to vote against the implementation of Bill C-132.

I have moved an amendment to the Bill in the belief that it will make the Bill less punitive than it now is. The intent of the amendment is to remove the capping from the year 1984. It will unfortunately leave in place the capping for 1983, which is unacceptable to our party. Even if this amendment is adopted, we will still vote against the Bill in total. However, it makes the Bill only half as punitive as the Minister wants it to be because it would restore indexing for the year 1984.

All Members of this House, whether they are in the New Democratic Party, the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party of Canada, should be very reluctant in the present economic circumstances to do anything that cuts the income of those Canadians who live at or near the poverty line. We should be especially careful about an intention to cut the incomes of those Canadians two years ahead of time. The present economic circumstances are such that there is absolutely no sense of certitude about the Canadian economy for the year 1984. We have very little certitude about what the economy will be like in 1983, but we are really out to lunch when we begin to think that we know what our economy will be like in 1984. It is not inconceivable that we might have runaway inflation by 1984. It is not inconceivable that the effect of this legislation, if Members do not vote for my amendment, will result in a 5 per cent capping in a 20 per cent inflation world.

Sometimes it is too bad that all Members of the House of Commons cannot attend a committee. If they had been at our Committee, they would have seen that other than the Minister