

Highways

fully people suffering from this condition and even cure them, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette):

That the House urge the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) to carry out an investigation, in co-operation with the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, into the usefulness of this vaccine and, should the findings prove positive, to recommend its import into Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REASON FOR INTERROGATING LESLIE J. BENNETT ON LEAVING FORCE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, under the terms of Standing Order 43 I rise to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pertaining to statements made to news media today by Leslie James Bennett, formerly with RCMP intelligence and now living in Australia under the name of John B. Ennett to the effect that he was interrogated by the RCMP at the time of his leaving the force. I therefore ask leave to move:

That the Solicitor General advise the House whether it is the policy of the government to interrogate high ranking RCMP officers when they leave the force and if so, why, and specifically why Mr. Bennett was heavily interrogated? Was it or was it not on the subject of infiltration of security services by a foreign power and, finally, to the knowledge of the government were members of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency permitted to interrogate Mr. Bennett as well and, if so, why such foreign interference was permitted by the government in the handling of Canadian internal security.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion presented. Is there unanimous consent as required under the provisions of Standing Order 43?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED FORMULA FOR SHARING COST OF IMPROVING TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY IN NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the Atlantic provinces have requested the government to share the cost of a 10-year program for reconstruction and upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway in their provinces on the basis of a 90-10 cost-sharing split but the Minister of Transport refuses

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

to accept anything other than a 50-50 cost-sharing scheme, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of State for External Affairs stated in Newfoundland that Ottawa's position would be reviewed and reconsidered while the Minister of Transport was stating that this 50-50 offer was the final decision, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House direct the government of Canada to enter into an agreement with the Atlantic provinces so that the costs of reconstructing, resurfacing and upgrading the Trans-Canada Highway in those provinces will be met 75 per cent by the government of Canada and 25 per cent by the provinces thus reconciling the differing views of these ministers.

• (1412)

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion can be presented for debate at this time pursuant to Standing Order 43 only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

SOCIAL SERVICES

REJECTION BY PROVINCE OF BLOCK FINANCING FORMULA—
POSSIBILITY OF OTHER METHOD OF FINANCING

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and it is related to the block financing formula suggested by the minister as regards social services. Considering the decision of the government to drop Bill C-57 during the second session, and given the unanimous rejection by the provinces of this block financing formula in a joint release issued less than a week after the announcement of this formula, did the minister consider other methods for financing or developing social services and, if so, what are these methods?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had already informed the House on the details of this file, but I shall be pleased to repeat them for the hon. member. When I became minister, I immediately took back the file when the provinces had just been offered a lump sum payment for social services, very much like the one which has already been in existence for one year and which applies to health services. The provinces said in a release that they did not appreciate the way the counter-proposal had been made. They did not reject the proposal itself but the way the offer had been made. This is a matter for discussion and it does not affect the substance of the problem. On this, I am only waiting for two formal answers from the provinces. One province refused officially the proposal for lump sum payment while most of the other provinces expressed a preference for this financing pattern. Only one asked to