

Income Tax Act

deduct 3 per cent of their income or up to a limit of \$150 a year for expenses incurred while working. I can take the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre down to the trades hall located in his constituency and introduce him—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is not quite in his constituency; it is in the constituency of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—to a dozen people in his constituency who belong to unions. In the course of their work these people are required to buy safety boots, hard hats and tools. I can introduce him to dozens of people who have to drive 35 to 50 miles each way, daily, to get to the construction site where they are employed. For these people the government, which believes in a just society, which wants to give us a system of equitable taxation, has provided a deduction of \$150 a year. This is what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) are applauding.

Let us compare that with the deductions permitted the businessman or the self-employed person. He can go to a convention anywhere in the world as long as it pertains to his work, to earning an income, to creating more business for his company, and the entire expense will be borne by the taxpayer of Canada. He can take anybody he likes out for dinner or lunch and the cost of the meal and the drinks will be charged to the taxpayer. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if tomorrow we were to go to the Chateau Laurier or the Skyline Hotel at lunch time, 75 per cent of the people present would be on expense accounts. Why can we not get the same kind...

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member be kind enough to answer a very short question? Is not the same principle applied to union leaders when they have to meet their people?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, first of all, union leaders do not...

Mr. Prud'homme: I have been entertained by them.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was entertained by union leaders because they thought they would benefit in some way, they certainly threw their money away.

Mr. Stanbury: He can't be bought.

Mr. Orlikow: I do not know how the expenses incurred by union leaders are charged, or whether they are taxed. To my knowledge, no trade union makes a profit or files an income tax return or corporation tax return. I do not know how a union leader's expenses can be charged to the taxpayer. They may be charged to the union member, but not to the taxpayer. Even if this were the case, it would be just as improper as for the businessman who charges his expenses to the taxpayer.

Mr. Faulkner: Absolutely.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) says "absolutely" and I agree with him. I am not saying that businessmen should not be permitted to charge expenses. What I am saying to the hon. member

[Mr. Orlikow.]

for Peterborough, who represents a heavily unionized constituency, is that union members should be entitled to some of the same tax benefits as the businessman who contributes to his campaign.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

AIR TRANSPORT—AIRLINE PILOTS' REQUEST FOR EARLY ACTION ON HIJACKING

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, on September 10, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) if he had received a telegram from the Canadian Airline Pilots Association requesting early ratification of the Hague convention on aircraft hijacking and whether the government would soon introduce legislation on this matter, as promised. I should point out that on November 26, 1970, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in answering a question from the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) said that he hoped to introduce legislation this session. This can be found in *Hansard* at page 1495.

• (10:00 p.m.)

On May 13, 1971, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Béchard), speaking in the adjournment debate on behalf of the minister stated that his department was preparing a series of amendments to the Criminal Code, including certain articles on hijacking, and that these would be introduced shortly. When the Secretary of State for External Affairs answered my question the other day he said the matter was under study, but he could not give me a definite answer at that time. It is for that reason that I raise my question in the adjournment debate, hoping to get a full answer tonight.

The entire question took on new importance last fall, on September 5, 1970, when the Palestinian guerrillas hijacked four jet aircraft simultaneously and held the aircraft and passengers as hostages. Up until that time most of the hijacking was the work of individuals or small groups. The Palestinian guerrillas' hijackings were organized on a large scale for political purposes and placed many lives and much property in danger. Later in the fall, on October 15, 1970, a Soviet airliner was hijacked to Turkey, the stewardess was murdered and two pilots wounded. These events led to world wide discussion of the problem.

The twenty-fifth General Assembly of the United Nations during the fall of 1970 passed a resolution condemning hijacking in all forms and requested action by all countries to make it illegal. The resolution passed by 105 to none, with eight abstentions. Canada voted in favour of the resolution. The Security Council of the United Nations passed a resolution without a formal vote condemning hijacking and appealing for the release of the hostages who were being held.