

### Oral Questions

was on the scene at 3.20 a.m., 35 minutes after the order had been given on the *Ocean Ranger* to abandon ship.

**Hon. J. Gilles Lamontagne (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, the answer to this question is very simple. In rescue operations there is a big difference between what can be accomplished with an airplane and what can be accomplished with a ship. As the hon. member knows, the weather at the time made it impossible for the plane to take off on time. Some of the rescue planes were ready to fly and some helicopters were also ready to fly, but they could not take off because of the adverse weather conditions. I think this is the only answer I can give the hon. member. From the information that I have, I am not aware that there was any abnormal delay, or change from what we usually do in such cases; we made every effort to ensure that we were there as fast as was possible and that we responded as soon as possible after the call was received by us.

#### EQUIPMENT ON HELICOPTERS STATIONED AT GANDER, NFLD.

**Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** As a supplementary question, Madam Speaker, could the minister explain to the House why the Universal Helicopter which received the distress call at the same time, 1 a.m., was on the scene at 3.20 a.m., while the Armed Forces rescue helicopters from Gander did not reach the scene until 10 a.m., nine hours later? Could it be that the helicopters at Gander do not have the necessary equipment to operate in this kind of weather?

**Hon. J. Gilles Lamontagne (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I think the last part of the hon. member's question is true; the civilian helicopter did not have the necessary equipment to rescue people. For example, it was not equipped with the hoist equipment which is very important in a rescue operation. Our rescue helicopters are equipped with that equipment.

I will inquire why there was such a delay, but as far as I am aware there would have been no reason why we could not have been on the scene of the tragedy, providing the weather had permitted.

I do not want to presume, but I think that the inquiry into the tragedy of the *Ocean Ranger* will indeed prove that regardless of the amount of equipment we could have had; twice or three times or five times as much, we could not have saved any of the lives lost.

\* \* \*

### FINANCE

#### SOCIAL SECURITY CONTRIBUTIONS PAID BY FOREIGN DOMESTIC SERVANTS

**Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The minister is probably aware that individuals who are employed in domestic service in Canada on work permits must pay the normal contributions for unemployment insurance and Canada

Pension even though they can never collect either benefit, since they must leave Canada as soon as their employment terminates. Has the minister considered the unfairness of these taxes which are imposed upon this group of people in his recent budget and, if not, will he give the matter consideration soon?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I do not recall having considered these particular cases specifically but I will keep in mind the hon. member's representations and consider the views he has expressed.

#### CHILD CARE TAX DEDUCTION

**Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. It is usually working mothers in Canada who employ these domestics so that they may go out to earn a living. At the moment the minister is allowing the magnanimous child care deduction of \$1,000, which has been unchanged for the past six years, although child care expenses are many times that exemption. Would the minister please keep that in mind when he is considering the other matter?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Yes, Madam Speaker. The question of the child care exemption or deduction is presently under consideration, as I recollect, by an interdepartmental committee. It has not been possible to reach a conclusion but it is an area that I believe deserves consideration.

\* \* \*

### FISHERIES

#### ALLOCATION OF FISHING RIGHTS TO WEST COAST TROLLERS

**Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. As the minister knows, there are a number of small communities on the west coast which are very dependent upon the west coast fishing fleet, especially the trollers. I understand that representatives of the trollers' association met the minister recently.

In the allocation of the stocks of the salmon catch, which have been steadily reduced for the trollers from 30 per cent to 25 per cent then to 20 per cent, is it the policy of the department, to consider the effect this will have on the coastal communities? Has he considered that the consequence of reduced catches might cause the troller fleet to withdraw from those communities?

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the presence in our gallery of Mr. Clem Tillion, the former president of the Senate of Alaska who is now the director of international fisheries for the Governor of Alaska. I had a very pleasant discussion with Mr. Tillion at lunch today.