

Alberta-B.C. Boundary Act

Canadian Arsenals Limited. As it costs the Canadian taxpayer about \$3.5 million a year to keep it alive, will the minister advise the House if he plans to close down the corporation.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I shall soon be in a position to inform the House of the steps we intend to take to reorganize completely Canadian Arsenals Limited, in order to increase our efficiency and to be able to reduce, and perhaps do away with our deficit.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICE**REGIONAL PAY DIFFERENTIAL—REQUEST FOR EQUALITY OF TREATMENT**

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the dissatisfaction that an unreasonable pay differential creates for federal employees at Canadian Forces Base Penhold, will the President of the Treasury Board make an effort to see that federally employed personnel receive pay equal to that given to other personnel doing the same category of work in the provincial labour force.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we always try to give our employees adequate compensation for the work they do. National rates are often not comparable to the rates in certain areas, such as Alberta or other places. That is why we sometimes ask for regional rates in our consultations and negotiations with unions.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ALBERTA-BRITISH COLUMBIA BOUNDARY ACT, 1974**MEASURE TO ESTABLISH COMMISSION TO DELINEATE BOUNDARY**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Sharp, moves that Bill S-13, an act respecting the boundary between the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The position of the opposition is that this bill ought to go to committee. The hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) have certain reserva-

[Mr. Reynolds.]

tions with respect to the bill which can be dealt with in committee. We do not intend to hold up the bill at this stage. Our reservations concerning the bill are these. The bill provides for the boundary dispute to be settled by action involving the lieutenant governors of the two provinces and the governor in council, but makes no further provision for the final disposition of the matter.

Secondly, the bill does not specifically provide for public hearings, although one could infer from its language that a public hearing of the kind associated with boundary disputes involving municipalities and provinces is to be considered: there is no direct statement, although the implication is there. I thought I should express those two reservations before the bill goes to committee. We are content to let the bill pass at this stage without hearing from the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) as, despite our reservations, we wish to co-operate with the government in bringing forward legislation which we consider important, always subject, of course, to our right to express legitimate differences of opinion on important questions of principle. That being so, let me say that we of the official opposition intend to give this bill speedy passage and refer it to the committee.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the same point of order, I suggest that the points the hon. member has raised can better be dealt with when the bill is in committee. His substantive points cannot be dealt with satisfactorily on a point of order. I do not know why the hon. member raised the matter in this fashion at this point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understood that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) did not rise to make a substantive intervention in the debate at this point but, rather, to indicate that he was speaking on behalf of other members of his party who are prepared to see the bill go to committee quickly. Our present way of proceeding is unsatisfactory because we are restricted by the rules, which do not provide for the sort of exchange that is taking place. If there is disposition to refer the bill to committee quickly, we should let it go to committee. If there is disposition to debate it, we should do so. I see that an hon. member wishes to rise.

Mr. Foster: Speaking on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the bill has been properly moved by the minister. If it has, I plan to speak on it.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, may I comment further on what was said by the representative of my party, namely, that we do not wish to debate the bill but shall refer it to committee. I represent a constituency which for the past few years has shown considerable interest in the revision of the boundary. Various disputes involving local municipalities and the provincial government have arisen. As members may recall, it was suggested that the boundary between British Columbia and Alberta ought to be revised.

My point in rising is to ask the minister to give some assurance that by sending the bill to committee without debating it, we shall not be raising false hopes in parts of British Columbia. I hope the boundary dispute will not be settled solely on technicalities or by some secret arrange-