November 3, 1978

Rights Act—as the minister is now introducing it—will prevail over the Canadian Human Rights Act? Is that the view?

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is again trying to develop a theory based on hypothetical points. I would like to repeat that in Bill C-10 we are not interested in the marital status as a basis of the bill. We are concerned with motherhood, or the legal custody of the child, for the only reason that this is needed to determine who would be the beneficiary of the new child tax credit. This is not at all discriminatory. If the income comes from one source or two, if it comes from the father or the mother, if the mother is married, divorced, separated or unmarried, this does not affect the benefits to the children of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT WOULD WELCOME DEBATE ON CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Mr. Dennis Dawson (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. First of all, I should like to assure him that, contrary to what Quebec Premier Lévesque claims, the vast majority of Quebeckers would be very happy to see the constitution patriated: they feel that matter should be dealt with as soon as possible.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if, after having discussed the constitutional reform with the provincial premiers, the right hon. Prime Minister would be willing to hold a debate in the House on the subject, to give federal MPs, who also represent the electors of those provinces, a chance to express their views on this important matter.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the suggestion of the hon. member is excellent. I shall therefore suggest that the government House leader discuss this possibility not only with our caucus but also perhaps with the House leaders of the other parties. As for me, I should be happy not only to hear the views of the government members, but also to know exactly what the specific views are of the Leader of the Opposition about his negotiations with the premier concerning sovereignty association.

* *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

STATUS OF CHICKEN MARKETING AGENCY

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Gray-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Oral Questions

Whatever happened to the national chicken marketing agency? Whatever happened to the Minister of Agriculture?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Beatty: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us whatever happened to the national chicken marketing agency?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there never was a national chicken marketing agency, so nothing has happened to it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has promised Canadian producers, on numerous occasions, that this government would act on short order to create a national chicken marketing agency. Can he tell the House why he has not delivered on his promise, and also whether he has been able to secure the support of his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? If so, what preconditions were put on that support by the minister?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about farming and a national chicken marketing agency. I do believe we have the support of the hon. member, speaking for the glorious old Tory party on the other side—the unanimous support of the Tory party even including all the new members recently elected in the by-elections, etc.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Hang in there, baby!

Mr. Whelan: Maybe we should go ahead with it at this time. But I think the hon. member should realize that because of the devalued dollar, the poultry producers in Canada are enjoying a very good income at the present time: they are not suffering at all.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

EXTENDED USE OF SIN

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question was going to be addressed to the Solicitor General, but because of the time it took for me to get the floor, I will put it to the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

In view of the answer to the question on social insurance numbers yesterday, I gather it is government policy not to encourage any spread of the use of the SIN number beyond the three fields to which parliament has given legislative authority.

My question is this: would the minister approach his colleague, the Solicitor General, and point out to him that in a pamphlet put out in 1978 in connection with gun laws, in the application for a fire arms acquisition certificate it reads as follows:

Applications for firearms acquisition certificates will include the following-