

construction workers in Toronto alone at a cost of millions of dollars a week in unemployment insurance, and in view of the fact that there are many worthwhile projects requiring the talents of construction workers, projects such as those once promised to upgrade urban transit systems in places such as Toronto, can the minister tell the House what steps his department will take to deal specifically with crisis levels of unemployment among construction workers and generally among our one million unemployed? Is he willing to spend money both on construction in urban transit and on other municipal winter works?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, that is hardly a question which can be answered within the constraints of the question period. I suggest with respect that that question would more appropriately be directed to the Minister of Finance.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED NEW BUDGET TO GIVE TAX CONCESSIONS TO MIDDLE AND LOW INCOME GROUPS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Prime Minister, since the Minister of Manpower and Immigration copped out.

In view of the fact that construction in the private sector is stagnating or declining, a fact which indicates that the private sector has not reacted to hand-outs granted to them in the last couple of budgets, can the Prime Minister tell the House if he is now prepared to stimulate business investment and to improve the lot of working people by bringing in a new budget as soon as possible which will grant major tax concessions to low income and middle income groups of Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that seems to be the type of representation that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance would want to convey to the minister. The hon. member heard me say just a short while ago—and I believe the Minister of Finance has also said this—that we are concerned because the private sector has not taken up the slack which was provided for it in the budget. In that sense I agree with the concern of the hon. member.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LOG BOOMS IN NANAIMO RIVER ESTUARY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment. Would the minister advise the House if he is aware of the controversy surrounding the proposed development of Dukes Point, Nanaimo, British Columbia by the B.C. Development Corporation? Can he also state whether additional log booms

Business of the House

will be allowed in the Nanaimo River estuary, or is it still government policy to phase out existing log booms in this estuary for ecological reasons?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is still the policy of the government to phase out log booms. In fact, the movement is toward less and less use of log booms because of new techniques. With the adoption of Fisheries Act amendments it will now be possible to ask for plans to be submitted before construction begins. This is what is happening in this case. A letter of June 15 indicates to the company which wants to develop an operation in this area that more information will be required before clearance is given.

* * *

● (1500)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PLACE OF SITTING DURING PIPELINE DEBATE

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as leader of the House? In view of the statement you made, Mr. Speaker, this morning on the radio, to the effect that the extended sitting of this session to discuss pipelines will be held in the Senate chamber, and as the Senate will also be sitting there, which conjunction of circumstances has given rise to speculations as to who will be sitting where and when—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Abolish the Senate first.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):—can the government House leader clear this confusion by saying who will sit where, when?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am not certain I can give a clear answer to all the questions the hon. member raised. It has been suggested that the House of Commons, instead of sitting in the Senate chamber, might sit in the Victoria Museum.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): In the what?

Mr. Paproski: You might as well have the House sit in the Banff Springs.

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre clearly expressed a preference for the latter location I mentioned to the other place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: To heck with Stanley.

Mr. MacEachen: I believe, because some members opposite are interested in knowing what it would be like to sit in the Senate, that there is now some general agreement for sitting in