

The Address—Hon. M. Lambert

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks also to hon. members of this House. I will not abuse this privilege.

I have pointed out the inconsistencies in the answers of the Minister of National Revenue and of the Solicitor General with regard to this particular matter. I have also asked the Minister of National Revenue whether there are any other types of agreements with regard to the use of social insurance numbers, for instance, other than for that which may be given under this particular agreement. Is there any other type of agreement whereby the Minister of National Revenue can give selected bits of information from tax returns? We received a total non-answer the other day, but I want warn the hon. gentleman that he will have to produce that information somewhere along the line, and the sooner he can give the House the proper information the better it will be. If he wishes to join in this debate, that is perfectly fine. If he wishes to stand up on motions and make a statement to correct the information with which he inadvertently misled the House the other day, that is perfectly good as far as I am concerned.

There are other subjects on which I would have liked to have spoken, a particular subject being the rejection by the Treasury Board of the much needed improvements and modifications to the terminal at the Edmonton International Airport. I notice that the previous minister of transport, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) is here. He knows about this because those demands were in existence when he was minister. However, the situation has become chaotic. The matter is urgent, and no reason was given; simply that the Treasury Board had turned down these much needed improvements. It is not that I want to spend the money; it is that the public using that air terminal is being prejudiced. The public pays the airport user tax just as anybody else, but frankly cattle pens are better than the customs facilities there. We treat cattle better than we do people coming off major planes, and those people have to use those facilities. Calgary is doing much better. It has its Mirabel of the west at \$150 million, plus or minus. The public there can get customs clearance. People can be handled quite adequately there, but Treasury Board and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) have to come up with answers as to why for the third year in a row those improvements to the air terminal in Edmonton have been turned down. That is my plea.

I said I was going to mention one other point. It is with the greatest sadness and respect for the Chair that I say I do not think Mr. Speaker should introduce himself into controversial questions such as the one regarding the proposed layoffs by INCO at Sudbury. It is Mr. Speaker's own constituency, I know, but there is already controversy between the government of Canada and parties in this House. If I may say so, the Chair must not get itself involved on one side or another of the controversy. That is one of the limitations or characteristics of the Chair. Never, never, should Mr. Speaker, appear at a public controversial meeting.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

Mr. O'Connell: Not even in the House?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Outside the House. The hon. member may have different ideas as to the standards which should be followed by the Chair.

Mr. O'Connell: He is a member.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Let the hon. member make a speech, and possibly on some other occasion I will be able to reply to him. Let me simply say that I hope we will not see the Chair become involved. I have gone through this. The temptation was great, but I know all our predecessors in the Chair have deliberately abstained from controversy, even though during election campaigns one is involved. An election campaign is something different. This should not be done whilst the hon. gentleman is presiding in this House.

With that I thank hon. members for giving me this opportunity and allowing me to extend my remarks.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I notice that it is about eleven minutes to one. However, in the interests of using up all the time of the House I will refrain from the tendency of calling it one o'clock and proceed, and I presume with the indulgence of hon. members I will resume after the luncheon break.

First, like all speakers, I want to compliment the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Dawson) and also the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. Wood) for their splendid contributions to the throne speech debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: I happen to know something of that experience because it was ten years ago, I hate to admit, that I had the honour of moving the Address in Reply during centennial year.

Of course, this year was also a special occasion for the participants because of the gracious presence among us of Her Majesty the Queen. I know I speak for all Canadians and most particularly for my fellow Newfoundlanders when I say how delighted we were, not merely at the Queen's presence here, but also with the charm, dignity and grace with which she carried out such a tremendously heavy burden of functions and responsibilities while she was with us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: Understandably, the emphasis during this debate has been almost exclusively on what we can do and ought to do within Canada in order to bring about an improvement in present economic conditions. I say that this is the appropriate emphasis for most hon. members because it has been made abundantly clear that there is a great deal we can do within this country. There is a great deal in fact we must do of our own volition if we are to regain the momentum of economic progress which is so important to the future. I think it is also important in this debate that some member—perhaps I might venture to say that I am the most appropriate one