

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, discussions are probably going on today in Washington between the U.S. and Canada on the question of Georges Bank, which is an outstanding issue between Canada and the U.S. As the hon. member knows, there is an overlapping claim with respect to Georges Bank, and that is a matter that is now under discussion between Canada and the U.S. Certainly, no action taken by the EEC with the U.S. or any other country in any way diminishes Canada's claim to the lines which it has put forward in its negotiations.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Perhaps the minister can then explain to the House why it is that Canada, which made its unilateral declaration in January, was unable to obtain a similar agreement from the EEC as the United States has been able to do, therefore placing our claim in an inferior position to that of the U.S.? We do not have recognition by EEC of the claim to Georges Bank. Can the minister explain why Canada failed to obtain such an agreement while the U.S. was successful?

**Mr. MacEachen:** As the hon. member may recall, before we undertook the unilateral declaration of the 200-mile limit, we had worked out with a number of European countries, apart from the U.S., bilateral agreements in which there was an explicit recognition of the regime that would exist within the Canadian 200-mile limit. But without challenging the accuracy of the hon. member's statement, I question very much whether an agreement of that kind would have any effect on the resolution of the disagreement which exists between Canada and the U.S. with respect to Georges Bank. That is a matter for discussion between the two countries and settlement, which is the route we are taking at the present time.

**Mr. Leggatt:** In view of the fact that the EEC has recognized U.S. territorial claims without officially recognizing ours, after the March 1 declaration of the United States when their territorial claims will become law, is it Canada's intention to apprehend vessels entering the Georges Bank disputed area which do not hold Canadian licenses but which hold American licenses?

**Mr. MacEachen:** One of the items that is presently under discussion with the United States is what the joint attitude will be toward third parties on Georges Bank. It is unlikely that the jurisdiction will not be settled because we are very close to March 1 and both Canada and the United States have declared their lines.

\* \* \*

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

#### ELECTION EXPENSES

##### REASON FOR DELAY OF LIBERAL PARTY TO REPORT CONTRIBUTIONS

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the President of the Privy Council.

On February 18 I directed a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration about the report on political contributions to the Liberal party for the financial year 1975. The Minister for Manpower and Immigration referred me to the Minister of National Revenue and now she tells me that it is not within her jurisdiction. This is why I am asking today the President of the Privy Council why we cannot obtain before June 30, 1977 the report of the Liberal party on contributions in 1975 when all parties were supposed to table their report before the end of the financial year?

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will allow me, I shall answer his question. My French must have been distorted because I do not remember having said that my responsibilities are not my responsibilities. I am therefore pleased to advise the House that the Liberal Party of Canada, as requested last week, made a report to the Department of National Revenue, as prescribed by section 230.1(2), on contributions received during 1975. With regard to the contributions to all political parties in 1976, the parties, by ministerial decree, have until March 31, 1977 to report to my department. My report is then filed with the chief electoral officer, Mr. Hamel. That report, which of course is only a summary, will be made available. I shall see to it personally: as soon as possible after all pertinent information has been received, it will be made available.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

I thank the minister for her reply. I should also like to ask her whether the Liberal party had to ask the department for an extension?

**Miss Bégin:** My department advised me that the act had been complied with. Still, I shall enquire into the matter. I have not heard of any extension. We are referring here, I expect, to the report on contributions for the year 1975. No one requested an extension for that year: there is no question about that.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

#### FINANCE

##### STUDY OF PENSION PLANS—REQUEST FOR DETAILS—FUNDING OF CANADA PENSION PLAN

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. As the minister has indicated that the government has undertaken a study of retirement incomes which is wide enough to cover the private pension industry, will the minister now tell the House exactly who is conducting the study, what are the terms of reference, when will they report and to whom?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, officials in my department and officials in the Department of National Health and Welfare are engaged in the study. It is in the broadest sense to consider the questions of retirement income, particularly those related to the jurisdic-