

claim is claim number 3354. This contract was entered into by the Grafton Construction Company to buy 40 units of bazoos. A bazoo is an all terrain vehicle. It can go on land, water, mud or sand. It is an all purpose vehicle. Those units were sold to the Grafton Construction Company of Nairobi, Kenya. The goods were delivered and marked "Notify Bantam Plant Sales Company Limited". From all of the lengthy correspondence, I was able to learn from the government or its representative in Nairobi what part the Bantam sales organization played in this transaction.

I learned that the Bantam sales organization was to assemble the vehicles. The buyer was the Grafton Construction Company Limited. When the goods were inspected, it was found that some of the crates were damaged as well as some of the bazoos. The crates were landed at Mombasa and placed in bond. The Grafton Construction Company accepted the documents. The insurance company paid for the damaged goods. The insurance company accepted the claim, and for the goods which were damaged it paid \$10,000. Surely that was evidence that the goods were all there and accepted. The insurance company accepted the claim, but the Export Development Corporation would not accept it. That left \$30,000 still owed by this company.

The claim was pressed, and there was various correspondence. This went on from 1971 to December, 1975, when the last letter was filed, a period covering four years. I want to say to everyone in this House that expensive bureaucracy was never more demonstrated than it was in this little claim for \$30,000 which that small firm had to pay. It cost 13 men their jobs. I am illustrating this case because we were talking about big deals involving other corporations amounting to millions of dollars over 15 years. This matter extended over a period of five years. Over and over the minister stated that he was working on it to see what could be done.

The rules which are laid down plainly provide that the Export Development Corporation will reimburse a firm which goes broke, if it bought goods. The company was assured of this at the bank, but who paid? This little firm paid and, as I said, 13 people lost their jobs. Another firm bought this firm out. I say again that the minister should consider this and see that the little guy gets a fair deal. The machines which were built would have been of tremendous help in Kenya where the terrain goes from mud to lakes to streams to rivers, and so forth. Bazoos can go across all of those things. This equipment was needed.

I have a whole file of correspondence here. I only read part of it. I do not intend to put it all on the record. However, I want to say that the auditors in Kenya checked the books and found everything to be in order. Why did they go to all that trouble never to pay that claim? Why all this bureaucracy?

I think it is time we took a look at the bureaucracy we have today and are developing in this country at taxpayer's expense. In this case \$30,000 was involved. Two or three trips by the bureaucracy on its expensive aircraft could have been taken, the whole thing could have been paid on the expense incurred on investigation, it could have been written off and EDC could

have kept its word because the insurance company paid the claim.

I am appealing for a square deal not just for multinational corporations, for corporations which are going to borrow millions of dollars over a long period of years, and not for communist countries which are lent money at low rates of interest. I am appealing for small companies in Canada that hire Canadian workmen. They should be looked after on a small claim such as this just as attentively as a big corporation is looked after, as the hon. member for York-Simcoe said today, a company which may be establishing in some foreign country and which will compete with us because of the lower wage scale there. That is my point, and I hope the minister has listened attentively to the case of the little worker who, for five or six years, went through the wringer of bureaucracy and in the final analysis was cheated.

● (2020)

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one comment with respect to this matter. I feel that perhaps it could have been dealt with earlier if there had not been a difficulty with respect to this bill involving EDC which was first the subject matter of a \$1 item in the estimates. The opposition indicated its opposition at that time to this method of legislating, and the Chair upheld in part our position. I will not make any comment beyond that. This bill is the result of the position that was sustained by the Chair at the instance of the opposition.

As the debate on this bill closes I hope the government will learn the lesson of this bill and bear it in mind so that with regard to \$1 items in our estimates, items which are an attempt to legislate outside of the normal legislative process, the government will studiously avoid this kind of procedure. I think the record will show that, when speaking for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, at that time I indicated that we would give this bill swift passage when it came. I think the record will also show that we have done so in terms of the debate on this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

JUDGES ACT

AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE TIME SPENT AS MAGISTRATE IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR SENIOR POSITION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-50, to amend the Judges Act and other acts in respect of