

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for the views he has just expressed. I think he will agree, upon reflection, that it is not only the amount approved or recommended by the royal recommendation that cannot be changed but there is also a prohibition against a redirection of the amount that is approved or recommended to the House in the royal recommendation.

• (1430)

To my way of thinking, the hon. member proposed that any moneys committed under the act are to be redirected in a manner other than that envisaged in the royal recommendation which preceded the bill establishing the Regional Incentives Act. In addition, I suggest to the House, and to the hon. member in particular, that the effect of the proposed bill would be that the government would purchase control of private firms with public funds. I am not sure whether this second aspect is necessarily true. But certainly there is no doubt in my mind that there is a redistribution of funds and that this is contrary to the strict terms of the royal recommendation. In the circumstances, I do not think that a bill proposed in those specific terms ought to be put to the House.

AMENDMENT TO ENSURE THAT PUBLIC FUNDS ARE NOT USED AGAINST INTEREST OF CANADIAN ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-220, to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act.

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to ensure that public funds are not used contrary to the interests of achieving and maintaining Canadian economic independence.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

### ROCHDALE COLLEGE—FORECLOSURE ACTION

Question No. 43—**Mr. Ryan:**

1. With respect to the foreclosure action against Rochdale College by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (a) has a Notice of Desire to Redeem been filed by the original defendant (b) has a Writ of Possession been obtained (c) has a judgment been signed on the covenant of the mortgage with a reference ordered to determine the rights of subsequent encumbrancers?

2. Have any person, persons, firms or corporations registered claims against Rochdale College and, if so (a) in what amounts (b) on what security (c) which ones have intervened in the said foreclosure action to protect their equity?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of State for Urban Affairs):** 1. (a), (b) and (c) No. Pleadings have been noted closed

25310—25½

## Questions

against all the defendants, with the exception of Revenue Properties Central Developments Limited and Rochdale College, and affidavits of production have been filed by the required parties.

2. Yes. (a) and (b) Claims have been registered by the organizations listed below, in the amounts and on the basis of the security indicated: (i) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the amount of \$5,395,287, as at May 1, 1972, on the security of a mortgage. (ii) Rubin Corporation, now known as Revenue Properties Central Developments Limited, in the amount of \$417,838 as at May 31, 1971, on the security of a mortgage. This mortgage was subsequently assigned to the Royal Trust Company as Trustee. (iii) Campus Co-Operative Residences Incorporated in the amount of \$90,000 as at May 31, 1971, on the security of a mortgage. (iv) Nu Sigma Nu Fraternity in the amount of \$120,000 as at May 31, 1971, on the security of a mortgage. (v) Revenue Properties Central Developments Limited in the amount of \$245,044 as at May 31, 1971, on the security of a mortgage. (vi) Student Management Services in the amount of \$52,000 on the security of a debenture. (c) The following have intervened in the foreclosure action: Rubin Corporation (Revenue Properties Central Developments Limited), Campus Co-Operative Residences Incorporated, Nu Sigma Nu Fraternity, Revenue Properties Central Developments Limited, Rochdale College.

### TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA

Question No. 284—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. (a) Since South Africa left the Commonwealth in 1961, has there been an increase or decrease in trade between Canada and South Africa (b) what is the extent of this increase or decrease since 1961?

2. (a) Since South Africa left the Commonwealth in 1961, has there been an increase or decrease in Canadian investment in South Africa (b) what is the extent of this increase or decrease since 1961?

3. What is the extent of the "extensive sanctions" applied by Canada towards South Africa as referred to in the government's review of foreign policy (United Nations *Foreign Policy for Canadians*, Ottawa, 1970, p. 18.)?

4. Does Canada still accord South Africa the benefit of the British (or Commonwealth) preferential tariff and, if so, is the government considering abrogating this privilege?

**Mr. Bruce Howard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** 1. (a) (b) In 1961 total trade between Canada and South Africa amounted to \$50.4 million—Canadian exports \$37.8 million; Canadian imports \$12.6 million. In 1971 this trade totalled \$117.4 million—Canadian exports \$62.8 million; Canadian imports \$54.6 million.

2. The total book value of direct Canadian investment in South Africa in 1961 was \$17 million. In 1970, the last year for which figures are available, direct Canadian investment was \$70 million.

3. The "extensive sanctions" referred to in "*United Nations—Foreign Policy for Canadians*", page 18, are applied, not to South Africa, but to Rhodesia (as expressly stated in that document) in compliance with Security Council Resolution 253 of May 29, 1968 and formally enacted by an Order-in-Council on December 28, 1968.